THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

REFERENCE
room
Ambassador College
NOV 13 1979

AN INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY JOURNAL
dealing with Race and Inheritance in the Fields of
ETHNOLOGY · ETHNO- AND HUMAN GENETICS
ETHNO-PSYCHOLOGY · RACIAL HISTORY
DEMOGRAPHY AND ANTHROPO-GEOGRAPHY

MAN

Vol. VIII, No. 3 · January-March 1968
7s 6d · $1.50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IAAEE REPRINTS

FINDINGS ON RACIAL DIFFERENCES BY MODERN SCIENTISTS

These Reprints provide scholars, students and others with easy access to important articles on the race question by leading scientists, originally published in specialized professional journals. Currently available are thirteen titles. Others are in preparation. All are priced at 25 cents a copy, except Nos. 11 and 12 which are 50 cents.

1. KLINEBERG'S CHAPTER O[illegible] AND PSYCHOLOGY by Henry E. Garrett.
2. ZOOLOGICAL SUBSPECIES OF MAN by E. Ray[illegible]
3. ON T[illegible] PREJUDICE by A[illegible]
4. ET[illegible]RENCES by [illegible]
5. THE[illegible] EVOLUTION IN MAN by C. D. [illegible]gton.
6. THE EMERGENCE OF RACIAL GENETICS by R. Ruggles Gates.
7. THE RACIAL HISTORY OF SCANDINAVIA by Bertil J. Lundman.
8. SOME NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF THE 'MINORITIES' PROBLEM by George A. Lundber[illegible]
9. THE S.P.S.S.I. AND RACIAL DIFFER[illegible]ES by Henry E. Garrett.
10. SOCIAL SCIENCE TESTIMO[illegible]HE DESEGREGATION CASES: A P[illegible]PROFESSOR KENNETH CLARK by Err[illegible]g.
11. THE INHERITANCE OF[illegible]Y by Sir Cyril Burt.
12. THE AMERICAN M[illegible]'S MEANING TO US by John M.
13. PSYCHODIAGNO[illegible]SCHOOL DESEGREGATION A[illegible]Y by Clairette P. Armstrong.

Order from:

THE INTERNATIONAL A[illegible]R THE ADVANCEMENT OF ETHNOLOGY [illegible]UGENICS, INC.
P.O. Box 3495, Grand Central Station
New York, N.Y. 10017

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

20838

Race and Modern Science

Edited, with an introduction, by
Robert E. Kuttner

The sixteen monographs in this four-part volume—anthropology, biology, sociology and psychology—by natural and social scientists, many of whom are internationally known and recognized as authorities in their fields, explore the differences between the races of man. These essays are especially timely as a contribution to the body of modern scientific literature in view of the fact that for a number of [illegible] has been a sustained effort to explain away racial differences as nothing more than the color of the skin. The scientists brought together in this volume present evidence that the races of man differ not only in physical appearance but also psychologically and in various respects biologically.

484 pages *$7.95*

The Testing of Negro Intelligence

By Audrey M. Shuey

This new edition of Dr Shuey's important work, first published in 1958, is a thorough revision and updating of the earlier book. The work has been expanded with much new material added. In this new edition Dr Shuey summarizes 382 studies of mental tests given to Negroes and Whites in the United States during the last fifty years. Also included are results of tests of some 1600 Negroes in Ontario and the West Indian islands of Jamaica and Grand Cayman. Upon publication of the first edition Dr Corrado Gini, late president of the International Institute of Sociology, wrote: "... the volume constitutes a milestone in this area. After its publication, the burden of proof rests upon those who reject its conclusions."

578 pages *$6.50*

SOCIAL SCIENCE PRESS

310 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rivista di Etnografia

A yearly journal of

ETHNOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY, FOLKLORE,
CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY,
HISTORY OF RELIGIONS,
SOCIOLOGY, ETHNO-PSYCHOLOGY

Published under the auspices of
the National Research Council
Editor: Dr Giovanni Tucci

Subscription: 5000 lire (or equivalent) yearly

Rivista di Etnografia
via Belsito a Posillipo 17
Naples, Italy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. VIII, NO. 3 THE JANUARY-MARCH 1968

MANKIND

QUARTERLY

— mala opinio bene parta delectet —

EDITOR
R. GAYRE OF GAYRE, M.A., D.Phil., D.Pol.Sc., D.Sc.

HONORARY ASSOCIATE EDITORS
Professor HENRY E. GARRETT, Ph.D., D.Sc.
Professor MARIO CAPPIERI

FORMER HONORARY ASSOCIATE EDITORS
† Professor R. RUGGLES GATES, M.A., Ph.D., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.
† Professor CORRADO GINI, LL.D., D.Soc., D.Sc., D.Econ., D.Soc.Sc.

ASSISTANT EDITORS
REINOLD GAYRE OF GAYRE
ROBERT KUTTNER, B.S., Ph.D.
ROBERT H. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.G.S.

HONORARY ADVISORY BOARD
Professor Santiago Alcobé, Barcelona, Spain; Professor P. C. Biswas, Delhi, India; Sir Raphael Cilento, Brisbane, Australia; Professor Alberto Xavier da Cunha, Coimbra, Portugal; Professor Gerrit Daams, Kent, Ohio, U.S.A.; Professor A. P. Elkin, Sydney, Australia; Professor Luigi Gedda, Rome, Italy; Professor Dr E. Hanhart, Zurich, Switzerland; Professor J. D. J. Hofmeyr, Pretoria, South Africa; Professor Charles C. Josey, Indianapolis, Indiana, U.S.A.; Dr Watson Kirkconnell, Wolfville, Canada; Dr Taku Komai, Kyoto, Japan; Professor Bertil Lundman, Uppsala, Sweden; Professor Frank C. J. McGurk, Villanova, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.; Professor Branimiro Males, Tucuman, Argentina; Dr Clarence P. Oliver, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.; Professor S. D. Porteus, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.; Professor Stefan T. Possony, Stanford, California, U.S.A.; Dr David C. Rife, Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A.; Professor Alfredo Sacchetti, Naples, Italy; Professor M. R. Sahni, Panjab, India; Professor Herbert Sanborn, Tenessee, U.S.A.; Professor Walter Scheidt, Hamburg, West Germany; Dr John Scudder, New York, U.S.A.; Professor Sergio Sergi, Rome, Italy; Dr Audrey M. Shuey, Lynchburgh, Virginia, U.S.A.; Professor M. J. Sirks, Groningen, Netherlands; Professor Torsten Sjögren, Stockholm, Sweden; Professor Giovanni Tucci, Naples, Italy; Professor Harry Turney-High, Columbia, South Carolina, U.S.A.; Professor O. v. Verschuer, Münster, Westphalia, West Germany; Professor H. V. Vallois, Paris, France; Dr R. J. Walsh, Sydney, Australia; Professor K. Robert V. Wikman, Abo, Finland.

Published by
THE MANKIND QUARTERLY
1 Darnaway Street, Edinburgh 3, Scotland

AMBASSADOR COLLEGE LIBRARY
Bricket Wood,
St. Albans, Herts.
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. VIII, NO. 3 JANUARY-MARCH 1968

CONTENTS

UNESCO AND RACE: A STUDY IN INTELLECTUAL OPPRESSION
by Stefan T. Possony 115

USE OF ACCENTUATED ENVIRONMENTAL INEQUALITIES IN RESEARCH ON RACIAL DIFFERENCES
by Robert E. Kuttner 147

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES: A DISCUSSION OF THEIR EFFECTS AND CAUSES
by Kathleen Thayer 161

BOOK REVIEWS 166

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNESCO and Race

A Study in Intellectual Oppression

By STEFAN T. POSSONY

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be." Those words by Thomas Jefferson are most relevant to the discussion of taboo sciences. It will be asserted that there cannot be such a thing as a taboo science and, indeed, from the point of view of science itself, a taboo science is something like a wooden iron, or a dogmatic science. But sometimes events occur which should not occur, sometimes there are things which could not possibly be, and sometimes contradictions in logic do not preclude reality in life.

Alas, there have been enough scientific taboos and dogmas in the past. Usually scientific anathemas and pseudo-religions result from a conflict between prevailing political ideologies and objective factual findings or the mere fearful anticipation of unwelcome discoveries. Intellectual oppression is by no means restricted to absolutist or totalitarian systems. It also operates in democracies where it should have no place.

At the present time the study of race is taboo; and the notion that differences between men are created, virtually exclusively, by environment is the prevailing dogma. UNESCO is the chief political agency for the defense of the dogma and the preservation of the taboo. For the first time in history thought control is exercised on a global scale.

On 23rd October 1967 UNESCO issued still another statement on *Race and Racial Prejudice*. This statement, signed by 18 experts from 16 countries, was the fourth of its kind. Through its sponsorship of four conferences on race problems, and of this series of pronouncements, UNESCO has been implementing United Nations Resolution 116B (VI) 1948. In the words of the 1953 report by UNESCO's Director General, the United Nations agency is conducting "an educational campaign 'designed to remove what is commonly known as racial prejudice'."

The method of bringing experts together to pontificate about race problems and issue manifestoes against racism originated in December 1938, when the American Association of University Professors, the American Anthropological Association and the American Psychological Association produced "resolutions" which were designed to combat Nazi race theories. In August 1939 the Seventh International Genetics Congress issued a "manifesto" on the same subject.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The various statements of 1938 and 1939 asserted that the psychological and cultural connotations of physical race variations, "if they exist, have not been ascertained by science" (American Anthropological Association). The psychologists averred that "no characteristic, inherent psychological differences which fundamentally distinguish so-called 'races' have been disclosed." The psychologists also affirmed that no basis had been found for the explanation of racial and national attitudes "in terms of innate mental differences." Nor has "conclusive evidence" been found "for racial or national differences in native intelligence and in inherited personality characteristics." The psychologists indicated that the members of any group have adequate biological heredity to acquire the "culture of the community in which they live," and that it is wrong to believe that "people must be related by blood in order to participate in the same cultural or intellectual heritage." Even if there were innate mental differences between groups, there would be no justification for repressive treatment: "No individual should be treated as an inferior merely because of his membership in one human group rather than another."

The geneticists rejected the "unscientific doctrine that good or bad genes are the monopoly of particular peoples." They also talked at length about the need for "major changes in social conditions, and correlative changes in human attitudes," to bring about the effective genetic improvement of mankind. They argued that the removal of race prejudice presupposes the elimination of "the conditions which make for war and economic exploitation," which supposedly "requires some effective sort of federation of the whole world." They asserted that proper conditions for an effective educational system cannot be achieved "unless there is an organization of production primarily for the benefit of consumer and worker, unless the conditions of employment are adapted to the needs of parents and especially of mothers, and unless dwellings, towns and community services generally are re-shaped with the good of children as one of their main objectives." There was some additional verbiage on "economic reconstruction" which would lay the groundwork for the "ultimate genetic improvement of man." It is "the task of this generation" to prepare the day of "economic reconstruction." It seems evident that the geneticists were talking about economic and social problems, about which they had no competence or even rudimentary knowledge. It is equally evident that they had adopted a purely Marxist philosophy. Presumably there were many regrets later.

The UNESCO series has reiterated the theories underlying the early manifestoes—as though the Nazis were still around and as though the Nazi "race doctrine" (which, as a body of theory, did not even exist) still required ponderous comment.

The 1967 UNESCO statement, which hopefully could be the last

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the series, talks little about the scientific aspects of race problems but castigates racial prejudice. It is, basically, a plan for psychological operations which "draws attention" to the points made in previous UNESCO statements and starts from the implicit premise that all that needs to be discovered about race has been found and analyzed already. Thus we read:

> Many anthropologists stress the importance of human variation, but believe that "racial" divisions have limited scientific interest and may even carry the risk of inviting abusive generalization. . . . Current biological knowledge does not permit us to impute cultural achievements to differences in genetic potential. . . . The peoples of the world today appear to possess equal biological potentialities for attaining any level of civilization. . . . Racism grossly falsifies the knowledge of human biology. . . . So-called "race" relations are social in origin rather than biological.

On this basis—that there is only "race" but no race—the "experts" agreed that "race prejudice" has purely social causes, including "anti-social beliefs," conditions of conquest, the characteristic psychology of "settler-societies," the existence of urban ghettos "in which individuals are deprived of equal access to employment, housing, political participation, education and the administration of justice," and "in many societies" the allocation of menial social and economic tasks to groups of different origin. They also asserted that "individuals with certain personality troubles may be particularly inclined to adopt and manifest racial prejudices." Still, "the foundations of the prejudices lie . . . in the economic and social system of a society."

Accordingly, elimination of racism and racial prejudice requires the changing of "those social situations which give rise to prejudice" and "preventing the prejudiced from acting in accordance with their belief." In addition, education, means of social and economic advancement, mass media and law "can be immediately and effectively mobilized for the elimination of racial prejudice." However, "decisions of a political nature" also are urgently required. Those decisions remained unspecified.

Even a superficial reading of this document shows that race prejudice is used, on the one hand, as an argument for the suspension of free speech in democratic societies, and on the other, as an argument for the accomplishment of a social, left-oriented revolution. It is surprising to find the names of some reputable scientists among the signatories of this document.

To save time, I will stipulate that there *is* racial prejudice and that such prejudice has created, and could create again, much social and political trouble, and could even result in catastrophe; that this prejudice derives in part from historical and social conditions and in part from misinterpretation of scientific data; and that it may be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

useful to inform the public authoritatively on assured knowledge bearing on race questions. But I will also state that I thoroughly disagree with a technique of selecting experts in order to predetermine findings. Just as strongly I disapprove of specialists recommending political measures which are not based on a proper foundation, which cannot possibly have been effectively discussed, and which, most assuredly, were not discussed openly by duly appointed political representatives. Moreover, the UNESCO recommendations have been presented under a false label. The task that was assigned to UNESCO was to disseminate "scientific data on race questions," not to set forth arguments about alleged or real race prejudice, or to propose socio-political reconstruction and revolution. I will now turn to a consideration of how effectively UNESCO has discharged its scientific assignment.

Sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly, the various UNESCO statements have taken the position that the investigation of racial differences is only of limited scientific interest. Nevertheless, UNESCO left no doubt that races are "real" and not mere artefacts of classification. The 1952 statement entitled *The Nature of Race and Race Differences* was a rather massive re-write of the 1950 statement which had evoked much criticism even in UNESCO circles.[1] It says: "We were . . . careful to avoid saying that, because races were all variable and many of them graded into each other, therefore, races did not exist. The physical anthropologist and the man in the street both know that races exist." One should be grateful for this concession.

There is a widespread belief that if race differences did in fact exist and were significant, the political and legal principle of equality would be weakened and might become inapplicable. Political enthusiasts who are impatient with scientific methodology and who believe in equality as a supreme goal tend to persuade themselves that the existence of race differences must be denied on *a priori* grounds—which purpose would be best accomplished by prohibiting research on the matter. Actually, the two problems have nothing to do with one another: the principle of equality is valid or invalid whether or not there are substantial race differences. The UNESCO statement of 1950 clarified this point: "It must be asserted with the utmost emphasis that equality as an ethical principle in no way depends upon the assertion that human beings are in fact equal in endowment. Obviously, individuals in all ethnic groups vary greatly among themselves in endowment." Although the text tended to minimize "the characteristics in which human groups differ from one another," it left no doubt that those differences do exist. Indeed, the principle of equality, which aims to correct handicaps, to ensure

[1] Yet UNESCO propagated mainly the 1950 text which has been reprinted in numerous books. There was a transparent attempt to assign the 1952 corrective to a "memory-hole."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equal treatment to unequal persons, and to provide justice on the basis of non-privilege,[2] would make no sense unless it were addressed to *real* differences between individuals and groups.

The preface to the 1950 statement amplified this argument: "If, tomorrow, more accurate tests or more thorough studies should prove that 'races' as such do, in fact, have different innate faculties or aptitudes, UNESCO's moral position on the race question would not be changed." This simply means that race differences do not justify oppression; and, indeed, oppression cannot be justified by *any* argument. Nor are the commandments of morality and ethics affected by scientific discoveries. These commandments are eternal and apply to all human situations.

Nevertheless, scientific knowledge can help to implement ethical commandments effectively, while ignorance tends to produce harm even when morality is upheld. For example, it would be unjust to apply the same criminal code to two different groups, one with a high frequency of the disorder known as "running amok," the other without this trait. But this type of more subtle justice presupposes knowledge of the trait, its etiology, manifestations and distribution. It is equally unfair to standardize school systems for groups with different mental characteristics and learning abilities. This is the sort of thing UNESCO should have clarified if it wanted to disseminate useful knowledge. Instead, it chose to combat the prejudice of racism by the prejudice of anti-racism.

The introduction to the 1950 statement asserts that "racism . . . involves belief in the innate and absolute superiority of an arbitrarily defined human group over other equally arbitrarily defined groups. . . . Racism is by its nature aggressive." Racism likes to satisfy the "taste for domination," and defies scientific facts and the scientific method. Historically this was true often enough, except that the groups hardly were "arbitrarily defined." But "racism" is a political action doctrine, not a scientific endeavor; and not all political doctrines dealing with race are necessarily "racist." "Racism" is quite different from "raciology," which is a legitimate science and which, for that matter, has been discussed at length in UNESCO publications. This distinction has been blurred in the public mind, and UNESCO has done little to clarify terms. On the contrary, it has discouraged the legitimate—and moral—pursuit of an important science.

The study of Jews does not imply anti-Semitism, the study of the United States does not involve anti-Americanism, the study of Russia does not presuppose anti-Communism, the study of Com-

[2] There also is political equality which deals with political rights and eligibility to office. Utopian socialists propose economic equality, notably of income and wealth. There are various vague notions about equal housing, schooling and so on. Note that to assure materially equal treatment to materially unequal persons unequal means must be employed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munism does not require hostility to Russians, and the study of Negroes does not bespeak of an intent to hurt them. Emphasis on the racial factor as a prime historical agent is not identical with war, domination or genocide. Policies which take into account racial factors, where those are important, are no more "racist" than policies which reflect the shortage of goods aim at exploitation. Like all other sciences, raciology can be used for constructive or destructive purposes. Among the constructive purposes is the study of race to facilitate the co-operation between different cohabitating races; as well as to work toward removing handicaps which may be hindering the full development of groups in difficulty.

The 1967 statement asserted: "Racism falsely claims that there is a scientific basis for arranging groups hierarchically in terms of psychological and cultural characteristics that are immutable and innate. In this way it seeks to make existing differences appear inviolable as a means of permanently maintaining current relations between groups."

Yet the study of race does not require an *a priori* commitment to the thesis that psychological and cultural characteristics are either immutable or innate, or both. It does not presuppose notions about hierarchy. And it does not aim at maintaining any *status quo*—but it should aim at understanding real-life situations.

Whether or not the UNESCO criticism of racism is justified, it is a necessary scientific task to explain the character of inter-group relations, and the reasons and causes of existing situations, especially when such situations are unsatisfactory from the point of view of virtually all the groups and persons involved. The allegation that racial domination is economically advantageous to the dominant group, which was set forth very strongly in the 1939 statement by geneticists, has not been resumed in the UNESCO manifestoes except by implication. Yet it is worthwhile mentioning that unsatisfactory race relations are economically disadvantageous to both the dominant and the dominated group, and that, more particularly, the low incomes of racially "underprivileged" groups depress the incomes of the privileged group.

The argument concerning the hierarchical arrangement of various racial groups reflects popular convictions about "race superiority" or "inferiority." Those beliefs are deplorable and they should be fairly criticized. But it should be observed that no modern scientist has ever tried to establish such a "hierarchy." The notion of "superiority" is frequently used as a "red herring" to stifle discussions about race differences.

For one race to be "superior" to another, it would be necessary that all or most significant physical and mental traits be identified and measured. Given accurate measurements, the scores of race A must be consistently better than those of race B in all, or most, of the tests. No such measurements have ever been made and it is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most unlikely that there would be a one-sided distribution of key characteristics. Though cases exist where there is no overlap (for example, body height), most traits are distributed universally. The point is that trait *frequencies* vary between ethnic and racial groups and that most groups exhibit most traits.

Even if, in the sense indicated or in any other sense, there were a "superior" race, it certainly would not follow that the superior race would be entitled to rule the races with inferior performance. On this point I agree with UNESCO. On the contrary, the superior group, especially if its superiority extends to logic, wisdom and morality as well as economic productivity, is obliged to help the weaker or handicapped race. This crucial aspect of the race problem gets lost because of UNESCO's attempt to conceal and minimize race differences.

The standing of raciology has been bedevilled by the UNESCO allegation (for instance, in the 1950 statement) that raciologists must assume races—and ethnic groups—are stable. It is quite true that races and ethnic groups—and also many of their traits—are not static but dynamic. But it also is true that the so-called *grandes races* appear to be quite stable, and that race mixtures tend, in the long run, to revert to one or the other of the major stocks. No less important in this context is the well known fact of *Ahnenverlust*—the present world population of four-odd billion descends from one billion persons living four generations ago, not from 32 billion unrelated ancestors, or about ten billion if we account for siblings. This means that, assuming *panmixis*, everybody would have the same ancestors five to six generations back—which is, manifestly, not the case except for closed breeding pools. But it does mean that even the more open pools are inbreeding, that the members of nations usually are distant "cousins," and that, within the large national pools, assortative mating entails comparatively close kinship among the mating groups.

Even with Adam and Eve as common ancestors, the main breeding populations have been separated for 20,000 or more generations. Hence their genetic differences are bound to be significant, not merely because of genetic isolation and drift but also because of the interaction between the gene pools and the various environments. But those gene pools usually are quite stable, except that they may lose members and that migrants from several original groups may form a new gene pool. The larger the number of genes, the less significant will be the long-range impact of short periods of racial interbreeding involving only a small percentage of the dominant population: the intruding group will be largely absorbed phenotypically, although its genes will remain in the pool.

Be that as it may, the job is to investigate the facts as they are. Races certainly do not transform themselves within one or two generations.

The UNESCO experts have argued that there is a great deal of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confusion about the meaning of the term "race" and that there are too many confusing and often contradictory race classifications.

There are indeed numerous incompatible race classifications. The concepts of "race" and "nation" (or ethnic group) are frequently confused, partly because of outmoded semantic practices—for example, the "French race," the "human race," the "races of nobles," and even the "female race." The more modern usage of race as a breeding population also is inaccurate, because there are breeding populations in addition to and within races. Yet the 1950 statement defined race very properly as a "group or population characterized by some concentrations, relative as to frequency and distribution, of hereditary particles (genes)." Each population which could be defined as a race "differs from the others in the frequency of one or more genes." Thus, the biological classification and definition problems are soluble; and UNESCO might have used its influence to bring some order into the confusion.

However, there is no need for all sciences to use the same definition. The social scientist must deal with race as a factor in human relations. He is interested, for example, in contiguous and intermingled groups which display clearly perceived differences. In other words, his interest centers on the phenotypical, not on the genotypical, aspects of race; and this would be true even if there were phenotypical distinctions only. Scientific classifications need not and should not be *an sich*, let alone serve *l'art pour l'art*, but should conform to the problem under study. All races may possess equal genetic endowment. But if they perform differently, that distinctive performance needs investigation because, obviously, the lower performing group does not realize its potential. The UNESCO experts should have asked for research on performance lags. Instead, they acted like a physician who does not believe that there may be a serious illness.

The emphasis by some writers on "racial purity" is untenable. But most early writers—including Chamberlain, Ammon and even Gobineau—did stress the impact of migration and resultant mixing. The UNESCO statement of 1950 pointed out that race mixing "has been going on from the earliest times," which is correct and has been recognized by every raciologist. The UNESCO statement of 1952 adds that "one of the processes of race formation and race extinction or absorption is by means of hybridization between races," which is certainly true. In the words of the 1964 statement, "The history of any human population . . . is rich in instances of hybridization and those tend to become more and more numerous."

But what is the significance of miscegenation? "No convincing evidence has been adduced that race-mixture of itself produces biologically bad effects" (1950 statement).[3] There is "no reliable

[3] Note that UNESCO has displayed no interest in race extinction or absorption—as though such an event were without importance and need not be regarded as a bad effect.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evidence that disadvantageous effects are produced thereby" (1952). This may be correct. However, there is *some* evidence which raises doubts and which suggests the urgent need for fundamental research. This requirement should have been stated.

Instead, the 1964 statement went beyond the 1952 position of suspended judgment: "Interbreeding . . . contributes to the maintenance of biological ties between human groups and thus to the unity of the species in its diversity." Thus, the argument was deftly shifted to a different subject, namely to the "ties" between groups—whatever that is supposed to signify.

The 1964 statement, which almost seemed to favor miscegenation, averred that "it has never been proved that interbreeding has biological disadvantages *for mankind as a whole*" (my italics). This, surely, is tricky wording. No one knows what benefited or harmed the whole of humanity. Perhaps slavery, famine and war have benefited mankind as a whole by reducing the frequency of the unfit. The question is whether *specific* race mixtures are harmful or beneficial. The introduction to the 1952 statement disclosed that some panelists "thought it quite likely that hybridization of different races could lead to biologically advantageous results, although there was insufficient evidence to support any conclusion." Would this apply to *any* hybridization?

The 1952 statement summed up the argument: "The social results of race mixture, whether for good or ill, can generally be traced to social factors." But on the strength of this very wording, it cannot be so traced in all cases. Whatever the explanation about which we remain in the dark, race mixtures may have bad results. This finding should not have been obfuscated, for if genetic counselling is useful, in individual cases and on a high frequency basis, possible advantages and disadvantages of race mixtures would have to be considered—in the interests of the persons involved.

The matter is not quite as mysterious as the UNESCO experts allege. The historic evidence suggests that some mixtures are advantageous and others are disadvantageous. The problem could also be approached on a theoretical basis but, unfortunately, few geneticists have the courage to do so. Still, it is known that populations practicing assortative mating have a variance higher than that which would result from *panmixis*. A standard deviation of 12 is thought to be applicable to populations mixing at random, whereas assortative mating is correlated with a standard deviation of about 15. Breeding within a racial or ethnic unit is a form of assortative mating. The 1964 statement confirms that "mating[s] between members of different human groups . . . tend to mitigate the differentiations acquired." If we then assume that full hybridization would result in a lowering of the standard deviation from 15 to 12, it would follow that the persons possessing an I.Q. of 145 and over would be reduced from 135 to 9 per 10 million (median=100).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is, naturally, a theoretical example but it illustrates a possible danger. Other theoretical examples could show the feasibility of increasing the incidence of highly intelligent people through hybridization. There are, to be sure, examples of "hybrid vigor" (mostly in the first generation only), and there are examples of "hybrid debility." Clearly, generalizations are out of order.

But expressions like "advantageous" are relational terms. As a result of mixing between a higher and a lower I.Q. group the differences between intelligence levels would tend to diminish: the central measurements of the higher group would be reduced, and those of the lower group would be increased. This, undoubtedly, would be an advantage to the group with the lower I.Q. median but a disadvantage to the group with the higher median. Whether the change would be of benefit to mankind as a whole depends on numerous variables. The prediction depends on the assumptions one cares to make.

Thus, careful reading of the UNESCO statements on hybridization reveals that in the minds of the geneticists the problem is scientifically unresolved. Still, the contrary impression was conveyed. The 1964 statement went on record as saying that "no biological justification exists" for advising persons of different races against intermarriage "on racial grounds." Is there justification on other grounds? The Nazis were not alone in playing propaganda games with race problems.

Doubt has been expressed as to whether racial differences should be studied as priority items: racial divisions offer "limited scientific interest" (1964 and 1967 statements). The differences between individuals within a given race are usually larger than the differences between racial groups. Hence, it was implied, individual diversity should be studied first.

At the present state of biology and genetics it would seem to be of the highest interest to study populations with a different genetical make-up. There is, of course, no reason why differences between individuals, or between sub-races, or between ethnic groups of the same racial family, should not be studied. All those are legitimate lines of research which should be pursued simultaneously. One cannot know beforehand which particular line of investigation will yield useful results. It all depends on a researcher's interest. It is quite improper and unsound to interfere with freedom of research, and to describe entire areas of rather general and permanent interest (and ignorance) as unimportant or even as taboo.

I am happy to grant that the mapping of genes, for example, commands higher priority than race investigations. As a result of such mapping there may come a time when all classifications based on visible racial traits could be eliminated and human differences be expressed in terms of gene distributions exclusively. However, the biologists and geneticists are not the only workers in the vineyard. From the point of view of history, economics, social science and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

politics the race problem will continue to be significant as long as population groups with markedly different appearances and behavior patterns are cohabitating in the same state, or are otherwise interacting. If, in addition, there are continuing racial troubles and noticeably differential achievements, the problem will remain of the utmost scientific interest. This would be true even if it were considered that "for all practical social purposes 'race' is not so much a biological phenomenon as a social myth." (This extreme language of the 1950 statement was, wisely, dropped). Observe that while UNESCO has been laboring, race problems have been attracting ever greater attention, and "racial identification" has become more rather than less important.

In this connection it is worth mentioning that the 1967 statement opposes the thought that ethnic groups, in order to escape discrimination, should "abandon completely their cultural identity. It should be stressed that the efforts of these ethnic groups to preserve their cultural values should be encouraged." Disregarding the inappropriate restrictions of ethnicity to cultural factors, the thought is quite clear: integration entails the cultural destruction, and interbreeding ultimately leads to the genetic dissolution of the smaller ethnic or racial group. UNESCO begins to see some of the light, even if this doubt about the "melting pot" concept is not yet understood in the United States.

Whether race is a myth, a scientific (or heuristic) category or a reality, the study of actual differences between population groups is necessary for numerous mundane reasons, including medicine and education. If two or more distinct groups are living together, their respective capabilities and requirements must be understood lest their capabilities be used ineffectively and their requirements remain unsatisfied. The present plight of the Negro may be, in part, attributed to lack of proper research—despite the fact that the American Negro, allegedly, "has been researched to death."

Outside the field of physical anthropology, biology and medicine, race differences have been studied by means of intelligence tests. Considerable and surprising differences have been discovered. Note, however, that the entire range of testable mental differences has not yet been explored.

The tendency as exhibited in the various UNESCO statements has been to argue that test results do not indicate variation in "innate capacities," and that, to quote the text of 1952, "inherited genetic differences" are not a "major factor in producing the differences between the cultures and cultural achievements of different peoples or groups." And, "both innate capacity and environmental opportunity determine the results of tests of intelligence and temperament, though their relative importance is disputed." If the second statement is correct, the first assertion must be false. It is certainly unsubstantiated.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After explaining the various influences on the genetic composition of populations, the 1964 statement asserts that "general adaptability to the most diverse environments is in man more pronounced than his adaptations to specific environments." The implication is that man is able to live anywhere, hence he is supposedly a citizen of the world. This is a transparent half-truth: populations are living in specific environments to which they obviously must be well adapted.[4] Populations migrate from time to time, and individuals of all races are found everywhere, but migrating groups tend to select new habitats that resemble their old environments. Eskimos do not like the tropics, and Negroes do not gravitate toward the arctic.

"For long millennia, progress made by man, in any field seems to have been increasingly, if not exclusively, based on culture and the transmission of cultural achievements and not on the transmission of genetic endowment. This implies a modification in the role of natural selection in man today" (1964). The point is that "cultural heredity" is one of the factors that distinguishes man from animal. The words "modification" and "increasingly" are well chosen: they imply that the "transmission of genetic endowment" was modified but not abolished, and that cultural transmission has been *variously* effective throughout human history. There is no evidence that human progress has been based exclusively on the transmission of cultural achievements. There cannot possibly be any evidence to show that human progress lacks a genetic base.

Why this Quixotic opposition to heredity? The implicit hypothesis seems to be that if differences are not due to "innate" causes they are not important, they are transitory and they are due to chance, or to such factors as "discrimination." But this does not follow at all. In the first place, if the genetic endowment and the environment are interacting, both obviously are "major factors." Hence, so long as we do not know the "relative importance" of "endowment" and "environment," we cannot make any firm statements on the significance of genetic capacity. If genetic endowment is a factor at all, and if populations are genetically different, then the non-physical environment, too, has a genetic basis. Obviously, nature and geography are given, but adjustment to naturally given factors like cold and heat is one of the most basic types of human action. "Endowment" is one of the factors shaping the technological and socio-cultural milieu and all inter-personal relations. But even if traits are transmitted through cultural channels, such traits have considerable persistence. Moreover, those cultural channels are quite refractory to conscious management. Since "culture" displays

[4] Note that the adaptation to a new habitat or a change in climate may entail both gain and loss of abilities. The possibility exists that adjustment to a torrid climate in past millennia required selection that was negative to activity, and hence to intelligence (see Nathaniel Weyl, "Enigmas of Native African Intelligence," THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, Vol. VII, No. 4, April-June 1967, pp. 216-232).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remarkable constancy, handicaps due to culture are not preferable to group handicaps due to heredity.

Secondly, it is reasonably clear that the term "intelligence" is a generic expression or a high level abstraction synthesizing numerous different aptitudes. It is probable that the "mix" between capacity and environment varies between traits and between individuals, and it does not necessarily remain constant within the same person. A very convincing case has been made to the effect that "the I.Q. range from about 70 to 90 might well be the region most affected by environment." By contrast, at the low and high levels (below 50 and above 120 I.Q.) "environment plays a relatively weak role."[5] At the same time, indications are that environment can exert its influence on a range of 20 to 30 I.Q. points.[6] Thus, the dichotomy between heredity and environment is a terrible and very much outdated oversimplification.

Thirdly, suppose that, to quote the statement of 1964, all differences "in the achievements of different peoples must be attributed solely to their cultural history." (The word "solely" is good evidence for the influence of the dogmatists). Suppose further that the "appearance," or assumption, according to which the peoples of the world "possess equal biological potentialities for attaining any civilizational level" should prove to be correct. Even in this case the *de facto* differences between phenotypical capacities must be determined and understood if they are to be acted upon wisely and if group capabilities are to be maximized.

The term "environment" no longer has any particular meaning except that it denotes all causative factors which are not genetic. It rules out but does not describe causes. It also is an intellectual artefact—something like ether in physics. Sometimes environmentalists refer to school systems, educational opportunities and school environments, and often they consider such specifics as school plants, teaching techniques, the salary and quality of teachers, and so on. Other environmentalists look to family background, family structure, child-rearing practices[7] and paternal, maternal and sibling attitudes. Many investigators are impressed by the impact of poverty, which tends to be discussed under various headings, such as income, housing, nutrition, employment, career prospects and medical care (especially in the pre- and post-natal phases). Quite a few ascribe importance to the psychological attitudes by the majority toward the minority population and to inter-personal relations. Others are interested in neighborhood, economic status, class position, cultural influences and the interrelations between majority

[5] Arthur R. Jensen, "Social Class and Perceptual Learning," *Mental Hygiene*, Vol. L, No. 2, April 1966, p. 229.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] On one untenable environmental thesis which asserts the traumatic effect of "abrupt weaning," see Nathaniel Weyl, *op. cit.*, pp. 224-229.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and minority culture. Many use "culture" and "environment" interchangeably. A new and important school is preoccupied with the biological environment, on which depend biochemical body processes. This set of factors is entirely distinct from the psychosocial and economic milieus. Surely it is also legitimate to consider attitudes to work and achievement, geography, climate, ideational factors, and catastrophes like epidemics, famine and war. "Environment" really means "everything," and hence it means virtually nothing.

Perhaps a few general remarks on "environment" may be in order:[8]

1. Environment can be stimulating or paralyzing. This difference must be viewed from both an objective and a subjective point of view. The environment may be objectively "rich," but persons living in it may not take advantage of their opportunities, whereas a "poor" environment may be exploited to the utmost.

2. Harsh environments may be stimulating, and soft environments may result in lowered energy. Only a few environments act like chains on a prisoner, as even the most impoverished milieu still allows substantial freedom of action.

3. Environment is ambivalent in that it may activate some people and slow down others, and in that good or bad conditions may entail bad or good effects.

4. Environment is transmitted but it also is recreated by each successive generation. It acts on man, but man also acts upon environment, which—within given parameters—has a great deal of plasticity.

5. Environment is a "given" but also an "accepted" and "utilized" factor. There are, in fact, several environments acting on the individual, including the environments of small in-groups and of large out-groups. These environments need not act in the same direction. Virtually all normal and enduring environmental obstacles can be overcome.

6. The environment is only a partial conditioner of individual action, and its "penetration power" varies with the type of individual.

7. Environment is opportunity, even when it is restrictive. The greater the opportunity the more the individual is able to achieve, but he must perceive and grasp the opportunity and apply effort.

8. Equality of opportunity means, essentially, unimpeded access to resources. (Environment can, in some of its aspects, be defined as resource availability). But access must be utilized. Equal school-

[8] In what follows I am talking only about "short term environment," and I neglect the long term interaction between natural environment and natural selection.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing, for example, does not *per se* provide equal opportunity: the question is whether there is equality in the absorption of the inputs provided by the school resources.

9. It is impossible to find equal environments. Two siblings growing up in the same family undoubtedly enjoy an equal social and economic environment; but their environments, in terms of their position within the family, their mutual attitudes, their school experiences and their own circle of friends, as well as their expectations and opportunities, are clearly unequal.

10. Environment can be changed in some of its aspects (for example, legislation and economics), but no one knows how to change environment to increase the achievements of entire populations (except in the rare case of eliminating severe artificial handicaps like slavery). It is not known, on the basis of present theories on environment, what precisely ought to be changed. If the factors to be changed were known, it would be necessary to find out whether the changes are feasible and how the changes could be accomplished without creating undesirable side effects. Once all this were scientifically determined, the program of change would require political support, and it would have to be executed. Thereupon our insight might be altered, and a new program would become necessary. The whole operation would be difficult and time-consuming. In view of the uncertainty and inaccuracy that attend all social sciences, and of the struggle aspects of all politics, the prognosis for success would be poor.

In brief, environmental manipulation may be indicated if and when a *specific* environmental factor can be correlated with a *specific* handicap. Otherwise, it is an illusion to think that human capacities can be improved through psycho-socio-economic environmental "planning," let alone through such planning exclusively. The famous Berkeley investigations on rats have shown that—in rats—the relative impact of heredity and environment on intelligence is something like six to one. Suppose, even, the ratio were the inverse of this for humans (it will not be): if we are interested in raising human intelligence, we will be far better off if this could be done through specific medical action rather than through social revolution whose cost is exorbitant and whose outcome is uncertain.

The 1950 statement asserts that anthropologists "never" consider mental characteristics as part of their race classifications. The 1952 statement is less apodictic and makes this assertion only about "most anthropologists." The 1964 statement alleges that "the concept of race is purely biological" and "that racial classifications . . . do not include mental traits or attributes as a taxonomic criterion."

This is a mischievous procedure because it implies that those who try their hand at mental classifications or who search for body-mind relationships do not belong to the annointed. It would have been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

correct to say that since antiquity the scientific literature has been replete with attempts to come to grips with the mind-body problem and with mental group characteristics, and that earlier generations of scientists, who were restricted to impressions and subjective observations, lacked the methodological tools to handle such complex tasks effectively, but that nowadays useful research about meaningful classifications is feasible and should be undertaken.

It might have suggested that comparative ethnic brain studies, which were beginning to show interesting results and were referenced in books published by UNESCO but have been dropped like a "hot potato," should be resumed. A similar remark could have been applied to electrophysiological research.

It would have been informative to indicate that in recent years the psychoanalytical school gained considerable insights in the "basic personality" of ethnic groups, and has advanced our understanding of national character. It would have been necessary to discuss the projective tests (Rohrschach, for example) which actually have been used to examine population groups. (American Negroes have been examined by investigators whom no one can accuse of "racial bias"). Tests of representative samples can and must be treated statistically; and in such treatments the ethnic factor must *nolens volens* be taken into consideration. The UNESCO statements do admit, grudgingly, that tests have resulted in non-uniform results. Instead of explaining those findings away, UNESCO might have been well advised to suggest that such studies be pushed, because a better comprehension of the diversity of mental patterns inevitably would provide deeper insight into "men's gifts," to use a UNESCO expression.

The 1964 statement acknowledges that "often there is . . . a certain degree of coincidence between physical traits . . . and linguistic and cultural traits." But, since there is "no known causal nexus" between these coincidences, "it is not justifiable to attribute cultural characteristics to the influence of the genetic inheritance." Perhaps so. But irrespective of the causes of the "coincidence" these correlations should be better known. UNESCO should have called for data and research, instead of taking a negative attitude and implying a highly superficial conclusion on genetic factors.

In the preamble to the 1952 statement we read that the experts agreed "to reserve race as the word to be used for anthropological classification of groups showing definite combinations of physical (including physiological) traits in characteristic proportions." This means that classification is based upon combinations of traits regardless of whether their nexus is known. Obviously, before the nexus can be determined, one must describe the elements which appear together. The UNESCO experts feign as though they have never heard of correlation analysis. In any event, if there *are* combinations of mental and physical traits, there is no scientific justifica-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion whatever to disregard the mental traits. And only if the correlations are shown to be purely accidental—in which case the analysis would show this, and in which case also the correlations would be variable over time—can it be decided whether mental traits should or should not be used taxonomically. But even if genetic inheritance and cultural characteristics were totally unrelated, typical traits clusters would have to be used to describe the characteristics of populations.

Note that we are still talking about frequency distributions, as should be obvious at this juncture in scientific history. But the matter is confused further by the 1964 statement which asserts that "certain psychological traits are at times attributed to particular peoples." This is beating a very dead horse—if the allegation is at all applicable to any author. No one today would attribute specific *traits* to specific peoples: only trait *frequencies* are characteristic of population groups. The traits as such appear, in most instances, to be universal. The trait clusters may change in time. Within the same ethnic group there may be several breeding subpools which show differences in important frequency distributions. All this should be regarded as platitudinous and should be fully known to the UNESCO experts.

The 1950 statement claims there is no "definite evidence" that there exist "inborn" differences of temperament between human groups. "Whatever group differences . . . there might be" are "greatly over-ridden by the individual differences, and by the differences springing from environmental factors." In other words, in this case even the UNESCO experts suspect a strong genetic contribution. They added: "As for personality and character, these may be considered raceless." Whether correct or not, this set of assertions implies that while some personality and character traits may not be tied to race and/or genetic endowment, other traits appear to be more closely related to racial and innate factors.

"Whether or not such assertions [about the correlation of peoples and traits] are valid, we do not find any basis for ascribing such traits to hereditary factors, until proof to the contrary is given" (1964). The way in which UNESCO expresses itself about these correlations surely discloses a negativistic and simplistic frame of mind. UNESCO should have called for research to overcome the uncertainty. But it is remarkable that the experts did not ask for proof which would definitely ascribe those traits to environmental factors. After all, if the environment causes all the differences, the nexus should be easy to show, and it would be helpful to everybody if the matter could be settled once and for all. Clearly, the genetic thesis could be knocked out by negative proof—by showing, in a positive manner, that the differences are attributable to environment. By not suggesting this obvious approach, UNESCO's bias was made quite transparent.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The UNESCO introduction to the 1950 statement said: "It matters little . . . whether the diversity of men's gifts be the result of biological or of cultural factors." If it matters little, why be afraid of the biological factors? What does this mean: "it matters little?" Little for what purpose? Is there so much diversity of "gifts" or is there diversity in the distribution of gifts and handicaps? It would seem to be the first task to ascertain the facts; the second task to explain them; and the third to devise curative procedures if some of the "gifts" should be troublesome or should be inadequately distributed. All this tortuosity suggests that the UNESCO experts are afraid to face up to the problem. But why assume that problems cannot be solved? Is problem-solving not the United Nations' main job?

The 1950 statement points out, correctly, that intelligence tests "do not in themselves enable us to differentiate safely between what is due to innate capacity and what is the result of environmental influences, training and education." The 1952 statement reiterates this point by saying that *both* factors determine the test results. This is fine but it might have been very useful if the UNESCO experts had reported what the various tests really show or fail to show. The known facts are passed over in silence.

The 1964 statement asserts that "heredity may have an influence on the variability shown by individuals within a given population in their responses to the psychological tests currently applied." But this influence would be exerted also on the variability between populations. It is added, quite incongruously, that "the genetic capacity for intellectual development . . . is one of the biological traits essential for . . . survival [of the species] in any natural or social environment." Yet the argument is not about species survival but about differences in surviving populations and differences in fitness.

The 1964 statement alleges lack of convincing evidence concerning the hereditary endowment "of human groups in regard to what is measured by these tests." It also mentions the "very great difficulty of determining what part heredity plays in the average differences observed in so-called tests of overall intelligence between populations of different cultures." These statements simply make the point that the matter is unresolved, which is true in the sense that the area of ignorance still is very large, that the respective shares of endowment and environment are disputed, and that quite probably there will not be one immutable "magic figure" but a complicated set of ratios that are variable within parameters. But observe that the statements studiously avoid asserting that heredity plays no rôle, and that intelligence has no genetic basis whatsoever. If intelligence does have a genetic basis, heredity *must* play a part, regardless of whether the intelligence of individuals or the intelligence distributions of populations are being studied. No arguments can be based, either way, on an admitted lack of evidence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is dubious practice for scientists to create the impression as though the lack of conclusive evidence indicates that suggestive evidence—which is available—lacks merit, and that the opposite is true of what as yet inconclusive evidence suggests.

The 1950 statement observes: "Wherever it has been possible to make allowances for differences in environmental opportunities, the tests have shown essential similarity in mental characters among all human groups." This statement happens to be incorrect and borders on misrepresentation. One notable discovery of I.Q. testing has been that mental profiles appear to differ between ethnic groups. Thus, one group may show higher scores for verbal reasoning, another group for number ability, and a third group for space relations.[9] The finding is that such ethnic score differences hold true for all social classes within each group. This, surely, points to qualitative mental differences of populations. At that, these tests merely confirm what history appears to have proved repeatedly.

With respect to the customary I.Q. scores measuring mental acuity (or aptitude for scholastic achievement), the 1952 statement alleges that, in "similar environments, the differences are usually very slight." But what are the meanings of "similar," "usual" and "slight"? The 1950 text provides some interpretation: "given similar degrees of cultural opportunity to realize their potentialities, the average achievement of the members of each ethnic group is about the same." This supposedly means that the medians of comparative ethnic tests are "about the same" given similar opportunities; but this is incorrect or, in any event, unproven. Significant differences, which have been observed, might be explained away by alleging variance in the opportunities. But such an explanation presupposes that a precise meaning be attached to "opportunity" or similar terms. Moreover, the utilization of opportunity is highly variable, and may be the crucial factor. Hence, the authors should have written: "Given similar degrees of potentiality and similar possibilities of its realization, the differences are usually very slight." But this would have changed the entire theory.

Professor McGurk[10] concluded from his studies that differences in mean scores "will disappear when cultural opportunities between the races are equal but extremely low; as cultural opportunities increase for each racial group, mean psychological test score differences increase." This is an extremely important finding, which must not be disregarded under any circumstance. It means, essentially, that in poor environments variance is reduced. This interrelationship should have been expected, especially by environmentalists. But the obverse of this proposition is that variance will

[9] See also Nathaniel Weyl, *op. cit.*, p. 227, and the literature cited by him.

[10] Frank C. J. McGurk, "The Culture Hypothesis and Psychological Tests," in *Race and Modern Science* (edited by Robert E. Kuttner), Social Science Press, New York, 1967, p. 377.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

increase as environments become richer and more complex, and if this is so it is merely logical to expect that future score differences probably will increase, in line with economic progress. This is the sort of problem which is of the highest social significance and which, since it spells danger, should command UNESCO's most urgent attention.

It is equally important to remember that differences may increase while median scores are rising: for the difference to grow, the score of the lower population need not remain stationary, nor must it decline. In fact, there are cases which indicate that I.Q. performances can improve despite a continuing impoverishment of the socio-economic milieu. Phenomena of this kind call for interpretation, since they may suggest remedial action for those groups whose medians do not rise despite milieu (or opportunity) improvements.

American Indians used to test substantially below American Negroes. Yet within a period of forty-odd years the Indians caught up, and Indian children currently out-perform Negro children as a group. In fact, in the first school year, the Indian score now exceeds the standardized Negro score by one standard deviation. This, in the words of Robert E. Kuttner, "represents a reversal of the Negro-Indian position on scholastic performance tests without a corresponding change in socio-economic status."[11]

The Indians continue to be the "most aggrieved minority." Their socio-economic environmental conditions have improved, but only moderately. Their progress has been far less than the corresponding material advance among the Negroes. Indian annual family income in 1959 was one-third of the White and two-fifths of the Negro family income. The average schooling of the Indian population is the lowest, and so is their life expectancy. Their housing is the poorest, and their infant mortality and unemployment is the highest. Indian cultural fragmentation is, in part, more recent than that of the Negroes, and the Indians, too, encounter "rejections" by the majority. By contrast, there is good evidence that Negro motivation for education is higher than the motivations of Indians; which is particularly surprising since the Indian scores improved so startlingly.

Perhaps Indian intelligence capability was latent; perhaps a minor improvement in the socio-economic factors was enough to allow the latent capability to break through; perhaps the progress was made possible by a much improved command of the English language; perhaps there was a change in the attitude to tests. We do not know the causes of this performance change which "should not have occurred." One explanation may be that Indian genetic potential is greater than Negro potential. But we cannot know

[11] Robert E. Kuttner, "Use of Accentuated Environmental Inequalities in Research on Racial Differences," THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, Vol. VIII, No. 3, January-March 1968, p. 157.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether there is not a similar latent potential among the Negroes which may need a far higher threshold of improvement in the socio-economic factors, or which may require a different type of activation than that provided so far.

If we want to deal with environmental factors only, it is safe to say that the factors which would allow a substantial advance of American Negro scores have not yet been identified. This should be stated unequivocally, and the widespread expectation that if we only spend 30 to 150 billion dollars the problem will be solved should be described as groundless, not because the curing of a major deficiency will not require money—it probably will—but because we do not know how the money should be spent. Actually, we do not know that we are only dealing with environmental factors. The need for better research is apparent.

"All normal human beings are capable of learning to share in a common life, to understand the nature of mutual service and reciprocity, and to respect social obligations and contracts" (1950). This is correct, but it shows merely that to survive all groups must necessarily attain certain minimal standards. The capability of sharing a common life has only minor bearing on the question of uneven distributions of intelligence above the minimum level. Obviously, normal man everywhere has the capability of accomplishing far more than this platitude suggests. Each group has its élites, creators and leaders. Nobel prize laureate Sir John C. Eccles suggested an approach more constructive than that chosen by UNESCO: "Everybody is a victim of some degree of mental impoverishment. . . . It is one of society's purposes to provide ways to reduce it to a minimum."[12]

The 1952 statement took a more cautious attitude than the 1950 text: "When . . . two groups have been brought up from childhood in similar environments, the differences are usually very slight. Moreover, there is good evidence that, given similar opportunities, the average performance, . . . and the variation round it, do not differ appreciably from one race to another." The first sentence is in many ways incorrect. (Note, incidentally, the implied theory about the importance of parallel upbringing in "similar environments"). The trick words in the second sentence are "similar opportunities." It is part of the problem of ethnic cohabitation that opportunities usually are *not* similar. Even if they were materially similar the ethnic factor would make a significant difference. There is no agreement about what precisely "similar opportunity" means in this context, and what the relevant factors of that opportunity are. There is, moreover, a fundamental difference in the opportunity as objectively given and as subjectively perceived. The argument also involves circular reasoning: if the performance difference is great, it is deduced that the opportunities are dissimilar. Since *de facto*

[12] *San José News*, 10th May 1968, p. 26.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

environments are highly dissimilar, it is useful that the 1952 statement admitted that the differences between nonliterate and "more civilized people" may be significant.

Under the circumstances it is sound methodology to suspend vague theorizing and look at the facts. Professor William B. Shockley calculated that the present Negro-White offset in the United States stands at 1.2 standard deviations (range 0.9 to 1.5).[13] This corresponds to 18 I.Q. points. The offset—in the other direction—between American Jews and non-Jewish White Americans is about 1.5 standard deviations. The report by Professor James S. Coleman, which was prepared for the United States government and is based on a most intensive investigation, indicates that Negroes score 1.1 standard deviations below Whites. This represents a "loss" of 1.6 years at grade 6 and of 3.3 years at grade 12. Note that the overall Negro score fails to reflect drop-outs. Oriental Americans score only 0.2 standard deviations lower; their scores in mathematics about equal those of the Whites (−0.05). The precise figures differ but there is excellent statistical agreement. The variations are significant and they all point in one direction. There is no study which would show that Negroes score 1.0 standard deviations *above* Americans. Keep in mind that some American states (for example, California, which is at about 103 median I.Q.), and apparently New Zealand and Canada also, exceed the United States standardized median. The I.Q. median of Scottish males was found to be 104. Figures about the White Rhodesians[14] suggest a median of 108 I.Q., or an offset of more than 0.5 standard deviations above the United States median. Some of these figures presumably reflect selective migration. Yet they describe real populations.

The 1950 statement reads: "The scientific evidence indicates that the range of mental capacities in all ethnic groups is much the same." This is true if we assume populations to be standardized as to numbers. Normally, the *range* lies, roughly, between the parameters of 50 and 150 I.Q., and 99.7 per cent of the population will be found within those limits. However, there is a simplification involved in this argument which conceals the real problem. Given a normal distribution and a population of 100 million, there are 130,000 persons with an I.Q. of 150-plus. Of those, we could expect several thousand in the 170 to 180 I.Q. range, a few hundred between 180 and 190, and a few scarce individuals of about 190 and even over 200 I.Q. As the population expands, still higher I.Q. values would

[13] William B. Shockley, "A 'Try Simplest Cases' Approach to the Heredity-Poverty-Crime Problem," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. LVII, No. 6, June 1967, pp. 1772-1773. Compare also *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*, Bantam Books, New York, 1968, pp. 424-426; and James S. Coleman, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966, pp. 20-21.

[14] Nathaniel Weyl, "White Rhodesians: An Unrecognized Intellectual Elite," THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, Vol. VII, No. 4, April-June 1967, pp. 207-210.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appear, while the higher values become less frequent in smaller populations (that is, they do not occur in each generation). The shape of the upper part of the curve appears to be less regular than the customary distribution.

This is the important point: it is in that upper extreme of the curve, which is usually neglected by statisticians, that the truly creative individuals are to be found. Hence, it is the small portion of 0.0013 and even 0.000013, and the precise shape of this sub-distribution, which decides the development of the entire population. But high intelligence and low intelligence do occur in all ethnic groups.

In real life the actual size of a group has considerable bearing on the matter. In small groups very high I.Q. types may not appear with any regularity, and the groups must be quite large to have a steady supply of high I.Q. types. For smaller groups to have such a supply, either a high median or high I.Q. immigration is required.

Once these facts are understood, which strongly dispute UNESCO prose, I gladly agree that no population could have survived unless the bulk of its membership was above a certain level of intelligence. The differences between the I.Q. medians are in fact far smaller than the 100 or so points of the usual range—since there cannot be populations with means at the genius or idiot levels.

The range of medians has been found to be 30 I.Q. points (80-110). If we assume that there is a Gaussian distribution of population medians, the standard deviation of this distribution would be 5 I.Q. points. To put this differently, two-thirds of the medians would fall between 90 and 100 I.Q. A standard deviation of 5 points might be considered as "usually very slight," except that such an evaluation misunderstands the meaning of the distribution: these "slight" variations strongly affect the numbers of, and the ratios between, low and high I.Q. types. This is the crucial fact which UNESCO failed to mention, but which it should have stressed.

It is, therefore, incorrect to describe the differences between groups brought up in "similar environments" as "usually very slight." To add to the confusion it is asserted: "Different groups of the same race occupying similarly high levels of civilization may yield considerable differences in intelligence tests."[15] There are differences in the performance of populations of the same *grande race*, but these happen to be slight when peoples of similar civilizational levels are compared. This is to be expected, for otherwise a group with low intelligence would be able to operate at a high civilizational level. This is most unlikely but let us admit on our part that there are not

[15] I presume this assertion does not refer to different social groups within one population, in which case it would be highly misleading. The Coleman Report indicates (p. 21) that twelfth-grade Negroes in the rural South score 0.8 standard deviations below Negroes in the metropolitan Northeast. (This may be partly due to selective migration).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

too many data. The UNESCO argument borders on the assertion that median differences between races are slight, while median intra-racial differences are large. This may sometimes be true; for instance, between Japanese and Americans. Variations appear to be considerable within the Caucasoid and Mongoloid *grandes races*, but there seems to be far less variance among Negroid groups. Still, the obverse case also exists, and inter-racial differences can be large: these are the cases requiring special attention. The study of inter-racial differences does not preclude the study of intra-racial differences—*all* these variations pose the requirement of thorough investigation, especially since the phenomena may have difference etiologies.

According to the 1952 statement: "Even those psychologists who claim to have found the greatest differences in intelligence between groups of different racial origin . . . always report that some members of the groups of inferior performance surpass not merely the lowest ranking member of the superior group, but also the average of its members." Surely, statistical distributions are bound to show overlap. If the UNESCO statements had stressed the statistical nature of racial intelligence differences, the point would have been considered as trivial.

Shockley's data show that the Negro-White overlap was 13 per cent during World War I and may have decreased to 7 per cent by 1966. Other data indicate that by 1966 the overlap may have been 16 per cent. McGurk summarizes six studies which, albeit with varying figures, indicate that the overlap remained about what it was, or declined. The highest reported overlap figure is 34 per cent. However, Shockley's figures reflect the very large military samples and may be closer to the mark. If we compare the Negro with the top United States populations—for instance, Californians or American Jews—the overlap would be 5 per cent.

To continue with the 1952 statement: "The normal individual, irrespective of race, is essentially educable." In the 1950 statement this thought was expressed as follows: "The one trait which above all others has been at a premium in the evolution of men's mental characters has been educability, plasticity. This is a trait which all human beings possess. It is indeed a species character of *Homo sapiens*."

All normal men are trainable, as are quite a few animals. The difference between training and education is a very significant one, which is glossed over in this text. Training is essentially the teaching of skills to be performed "mechanically" upon a signal (or in a particular situation perceived as a signal). Education provides the same skills, but it also makes available a body of knowledge which is *not* conditioned by signals but which can be drawn upon by the individual for the solving of unfamiliar and unprecedented problems. A problem-solving capability—which is merely strengthened and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

developed by education—must be imputed to every surviving population.

All normal men have the faculty of speech, and they would not have this faculty if they were unable to learn. It is also true that a large portion of persons with low I.Q.s can be trained. The question is whether all humans are educable to the same degree, whether there are differences in educability and plasticity, whether significant differences obtain between populations, and whether some populations are more educable in some areas of thinking than in others. Note that UNESCO talks about "men's mental characters." The plural implies differences and so, obviously, does the term "plasticity." This latter term necessarily also implies that people are able to adjust differently to similar environments and that adjustments are in fact dissimilar.

Plasticity does not depend exclusively on schools and teachers. It is, above all, a capacity which depends on the person himself. To illustrate: the opportunity to acquire a very large vocabulary exists for virtually everybody. Yet the vocabularies of individuals vary considerably. If there are large individual differences in plasticity, there also must be significant statistical differences in the plasticity of groups.

In this connection, a finding of the Coleman Report is pertinent:

> The achievement of minority people [American Negroes, Indians and so on] depends more on the schools they attend than does the achievement of majority peoples. Thus, 20% of the achievement of the negroes in the South is associated with the particular schools they go to, whereas only 10% of the achievements of whites in the South is. Except for oriental Americans, this general result is found for all minorities.

This suggests that there is a distinction between plasticity which can be developed by skillful educators and plasticity which is derived from an ability of self-starting and self-actualization.

Plasticity is little else than learning and self-teaching ability. This ability like all other abilities is unevenly distributed: observation shows that some people have more of it than others. Muscles of all healthy persons can be developed, but not everybody has the constitutional capacity to become a great athlete. Most persons can be taught to draw but few draw well, and still fewer have the potential for an artistic career. Virtually all humans are able to write or can be taught to write. But, to mention just one difference, handwritings differ vastly and the graphologists tell us that these differences arise from different personality and mental structures.

The professional educator is not satisfied with a cliché about plasticity but needs to know whether differential educational techniques, each adjusted to various I.Q. and mental types, may be more productive than standardized instruction formats. The original

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purpose of intelligence tests was precisely to measure the extent and type of educability of the person tested, and thus to facilitate the process of educating him according to his capacity. The indisputable finding of thousands of years of formal education and subsequent actual performance has been that there is stark inequality in the educability of individuals. Most people have made the personal experience that they are easy learners in their special talent areas but need skillful and "personalized" teaching in subjects for which they lack natural ("spontaneous" or "innate"?) aptitude.

"Talents" are unevenly distributed: this fact is of the greatest social importance because it provides for division of labor which allows for an efficient economy. It also provides for specialization which is at the root of science and technology. At the same time, the average person should have enough of a capacity even in his non-talent area that he can be taught to acquire the manifold skills necessary in a modern society. But this does not negate the importance of differences, hence of professional selection and election; and it poses the need for educational practices which take talent (and other) differences into full account. To be successful, each member of society needs a minimum all-round performance capability, but he also needs to maximize the skills which are derived from his best talents.

In the 1964 statement we read that "the peoples of the world today appear to possess equal biological potentialities for attaining any civilizational level. Differences in the achievements of different peoples must be attributed solely to their cultural history." The 1967 statement uses a more cautious "should" instead of "must." But there is a clear-cut contradiction with the 1952 text: "It is possible, though not proved, that some types of innate capacity for intellectual and emotional responses are commoner in one human group than in another, but it is certain that, within a single group, innate capacities vary as much as, if not more than, they do between different groups." So "innate" capacity seems to exist, after all.

The significance of the first sentence of this 1964 statement is hedged by the term "appear."[16] The meaning of the assertion depends on the interpretation of the term "potentialities." A potentiality is not a capacity: it is a possibility but not an existing or manifest reality. The term could imply an assumption concerning latent capacities, about which we are ignorant; or it could imply a capability to improve a given genetic endowment—for example, by application of eugenic means, or through immigration and assimilation.

One question which assertions of this type fail to answer is how *long* it would take for a developing group to reach the highest civilizational level: it hardly can be done within a few short years. A

[16] Actually, appearances point to unequal biological potentialities. The possession of equal endowment is hypothecated.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

second question is equally pertinent: how is this development to the highest level to be accomplished? But the third question is the most important: can each people develop to the highest civilizational level by itself or is it merely capable of taking over (or imitating) the highest civilization that was created elsewhere? Throughout history there was never an even development of civilization: instead there were leading and trailing groups. These rôles can be reversed in time, but not every people has demonstrated outstanding civilizational creativity. The ability to absorb or utilize resources and techniques developed abroad is a most important human gift which benefits all groups and makes international co-operation worthwhile. But if some groups are creative, albeit temporarily so, while others are predominantly imitative, there will be at any moment considerable inequality, regardless of whether at a later time the players will change their rôles. Why obfuscate this problem rather than clarify it?

The second sentence of the above 1964 text is entirely untenable and unsupported by "conclusive evidence." The known fact is that civilizations are highly differentiated, and that civilizations cannot always be compared in terms of "levels." Actually, it may be unsound to compare civilizations derived from fundamentally different principles—for example, mystical commitment to the hereafter, hedonism, or power. But let us assume we are referring to "modern" or "Western" technological-commercial-military civilization. Cultural achievements are, in large part, attributable to men of genius. Granted that every genius is creative within a given environment, cultural history cannot be the cause of individual achievements —history is an abstraction and cannot, therefore, be a *causa efficiens*. For that matter, the restriction to cultural history is entirely unwarranted; other types of history are equally important.

In any event, the assertion is contradicted by another dictum of 1964: "The genetic capacity for intellectual development . . . is one of the biological traits essential for [the species'] survival in any natural or social environment." If this is true, then cultural history is merely one of the conditioners of achievement. The 1967 statement, which really does not deal with scientific facts but is a propaganda instruction, speaks of "certain groups" which "have a lower average education and economic standing." Those effects are ascribed to "historical reasons." Yet the causes of such broad effects are inevitably multi-factorial. Nothing is gained by the hypothesis set forth by UNESCO.

The theme of historical causation was also discussed by the 1952 text: "Vast social changes have occurred that have not been connected in any way with changes in racial type. Historical and sociological studies thus support the view that genetic differences are of little significance in determining the social or cultural differences between different groups of men." There are few, if any, significant studies on the connection between social changes and changes in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

racial type. There have been vast changes which were due to migrations and therefore, presumably, were partly related to changes in the gene pool. Wars, famines and epidemics also affect heredity. Of course, there is no requirement that all social changes must have "racial" causes, and the wording leaves the possibility that some such changes may be so caused.

The text contains several errors in sheer logic:

1. If changes are not due to racial causation, they need not be due to historical and sociological causes either.

2. Genetic factors could be significant even if there are no changes in racial type. Racial change is just one kind of genetic change.

3. The expression "vast social change" has several unspecified meanings. A racial change takes time, while a vast social change may be a sudden event. A big reform to remedy organizational *anomie* is hardly connected with genetic factors. But the change in American domestic politics has been ascribed to the rise of "other-directed" personalities who gained ascendancy over the self-reliant types. If we accept this hypothesis, do we know what the causes of the proliferation of those personalities are? And how do we know the change is unconnected with a change in the gene pool caused by immigration?

4. If vast social changes have no necessary racial causes it does not follow that genetic differences are of "little significance."

5. How does one determine what is "little"? In terms of body weight, hormones and enzymes barely exist; and a battery costs less than one per cent of the car. The yardstick of evaluation has not been supplied by UNESCO.

There is, no doubt, an "essential similarity in mental characters among all human groups" (1950). "Available scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development" (1952). It is true, or so it would seem, that the human mind has a more or less identical structure everywhere—in all populations there is language, logic, numbering, religion, money, music, law, medicine, and so on. Since man is a species, such essential similarity must exist. Note that even the 1950 text does not assert identity of intellectual make-up.

Certainly, all human groups are able to develop, or improve themselves; otherwise all of us still would be *Homines erecti.* But where is there any evidence that development potentials are equal? (Incidentally, the notion of emotional development is quite unclear and it is doubtful that emotions show progression).

Generally speaking, all thinking is *potentially* accessible to the intelligent members of all races and ethnic groups. But the transfer

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from population to population is not easily accomplished and the absorptive capacity varies. The task of science is to distinguish between the variations within a broad phenomenon, and not to conceal distinctions. UNESCO does not address itself to the issue.

UNESCO has tried to marry science and politics, and it has clearly failed because it manipulated scientific methodology and evidence, and because it lacked clarity about sensible political objectives. The intention to eliminate racism is praiseworthy, but good intentions alone are insufficient to achieve an objective which even under the most favorable circumstances would be hard to realize. The hope that racism could be subdued if only the insignificance of race differences were asserted *ex officio vel ex cathedra* is naïve and almost ridiculous. Nationalism would not exist if nations did not exist, but the existence of nations does not imply that nationalism, let alone extreme and aggressive nationalism, is inevitable. Hence, minimizing the importance of the national factor would invite derision and would be regarded as an improper method of combating nationalism. But when the same childish approach is used toward race, it is viewed as a great feat in intellectual history.

The notion that race differences could best be denied through the allegation that such differences are due to environmental rather than genetic factors is politically irrelevant as long as people in their daily lives experience racial distinctions. But the UNESCO experts stick tenaciously to the environmental thesis because they make the implicit assumption that genetic differences (assuming these to be detrimental to one or the other group) cannot be overcome, whereas environments can be changed so that handicaps may be removed. Yet no one as yet has succeeded to "plan" socio-economic environments for the purpose of overcoming ethnic differences and/or handicaps, not to mention the fact that the re-structuring of a firmly established environment would require much time, considerable experiment and, undoubtedly, a great deal of violence. Naturally, restrictive practice and legislation such as a *numerus clausus* or a job reservation act can be lifted swiftly but this is significant only if the new opportunity can be utilized. If this proves impossible, the old restrictions are *not* thereby justified, but their mere abolition turns out to be an ineffective reform.

It is by no means a foregone conclusion that even if we knew how to change the socio-economic environment appropriately, such an alteration could be accomplished in less time than would be needed to carry through a fairly successful eugenics program.

Be that as it may, it appears feasible to affect genetic debilities through changes in the biological environment: the addition of iodine to water to cure goiter and reduce the incidence of idiocy, or the overcoming of short-sightedness through the use of eye-glasses, were proper, easy and cheap means to neutralize genetic defects. Intelligence is based on numerous genes. Consequently each of many

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

genes as well as various interactions could impair the functioning of the intellect. Accordingly, once the genetic basis of intelligence is understood, there will be different approaches to overcoming intellectual weakness and strengthening intellectual acuity, including measures of public health and preventive and curative medicine.

The ideal solution would not be a permanent revolution of the environment but the discovery of drugs which are susceptible of improving learning ability. It is unlikely that "smart pills" ever will solve the entire problem—environmental improvements, presumably, will remain necessary[17]—but if such pills can be effective the potency of environmental change probably will rise dramatically.

Thus, we are now beginning to come to grips with the effects of enzymes on brain activity. Papers were presented to the third international conference on the Future of the Brain Sciences showing learning ability can be improved by strengthening memory. The memory of mice can be improved by injections with metrazol and other drugs, by implanting strychnine crystals into a particular brain region, and by implanting electrodes into the brain and effecting tiny electrical shocks. Interestingly enough, the less intelligent strains of mice benefit more from such treatment than the more intelligent strains. All this is not more than suggestive, but it illuminates the way we should take to solve the problem.

The greatest objection to the UNESCO effort is that "the mountain labored and a ridiculous mouse was born." One of the outstanding facts of modern life is that a population with an I.Q. median of 90 to 100 was well fitted for a society practising an agricultural economy and transmitting into industrialization. But a highly developed technological society in which scientific and technological knowledge is doubling every 15 years cannot in the long run be supported if the frequency of high intelligence is not increased substantially.

There is, within each profession, a fairly broad range of I.Q.s among its practitioners. Yet various analyses have shown that skilled laborers such as machinists have a mean I.Q. of 110 (plus or minus 16); clerical workers, 117 (plus or minus 13); and technical engineers, 127 (plus or minus 12). By contrast, the more simple manual professions have historically ranged down to a mean I.Q. of 80 and below. The high I.Q. professions provide about twice as much lifetime earnings, or even more, as the low I.Q. professions.[18]

[17] On the impact of kwashiorkor, or acute protein deficiency, and other nutritional ailments, see Nathaniel Weyl, "Enigmas of Native African Intelligence," *op. cit.*, pp. 229-232. Kwashiorkor may be transmitted to a foetus and lactating child. Phenylketonuria, a genetic disease with an incidence of 1 : 25,000 to 1 : 50,000, can be cured by nutritional measures.

[18] Steven G. Vandenberg, *Genetic Factors in Poverty: A Psychologist's Point-of-view*, Louisville Twin Study, Child Development Unit, Department of Pediatrics, University of Louisville School of Medicine, Report No. 27, July 1967, pp. 21-23.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a modern technological society, persons with an I.Q. below 70 are essentially unemployable on a permanent basis. They may find an occasional unskilled job but for most of their lives they must receive subventions or be supported altogether. Note that in a population with an I.Q. median of 80 they would number about one quarter of all people.[19] Clearly, the progress of such a population would be severely handicapped.

Now, the same modern society is dependent upon an adequate supply of persons having an I.Q. of 125 and above. This supply is practically non-existent in a population with a median of 80—it is 0.1 per cent. Populations with I.Q. medians of 90, 100 and 110 have respectively 1, 5 and 16 per cent of intelligent (I.Q. 125-plus) people. But, perhaps, the ratio between problem-solvers (I.Q. 125-plus) and problem-persons (I.Q. 70-minus) is one of the most significant measures of the progress potential of a population:

Median I.Q. of population of 1,000,000	Ratio of Problem-Solvers to Problem-Persons[20]
80	1 : 200
90	1 : 9
100	2 : 1
110	40 : 1

As more and more of the simple jobs can be automated there will be growing structural unemployment in the unskilled professions, while the labor shortage in the high I.Q. professions may become catastrophic. Consequently, whether or not the Indian or Negro I.Q. median is below the median of the American Whites—or whether there are similar or worse differences in other societies—is really not too significant a problem.

It is important that, if the world is to preserve the momentum of technological and economic progress, the I.Q. median of *all* populations be raised substantially. This requirement applies to populations with the presently highest I.Q. medians. The evidence suggests that we need populations with I.Q. medians of about 125. In other words, the currently most intelligent populations are by at least one standard deviation below desirable fitness.

The task, therefore, is to raise intelligence levels: that is, raise the medians, ameliorate the élite and improve the intellectual capability of the stupid.

There are ideas how this goal could be achieved, but not enough is known to map out a program. Yet it is clear that we must understand the causes of our predicament, we must enlarge our research efforts, and we must, world-wide, commit ourselves to the objective of improving intelligence distributions.

[19] This is on the assumption of a regular normal curve with a standard deviation of 15.

[20] Normal distribution assumed, with a standard deviation of 15.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNESCO had a chance to identify the problem, to suggest a strategy, to define a goal, to win adherence to this goal and to get the United Nations behind a reasonable and practical implementing program of world-wide co-operation. This would have been a constructive approach, and it would have by-passed racism as a factor impeding progress. Instead, the UNESCO experts did not even see the real problem and they embarked upon a purely negativistic effort. They behaved like Don Quixote fighting the windmills of a past age.

The invention of intelligence testing by Binet has resulted in one of the great discoveries of history. This is so regardless of the past and present imperfections of the testing instrument. This discovery deals with the distribution of intelligence, with the inadequacy of this distribution in *all* societies—but in some more than in others—and with both the shortage of high intelligence and the intellectual shortcomings of most élites. We should make the most of these discoveries. We must stop behaving like a patient who is unhappy about his illness and tries to cure himself by breaking the thermometer. If the facts that could have been unearthed by intelligence testing about the Jews had been known before 1933, it is likely that genocide would not have taken place, even if anti-Semitism would have continued among the Nazis. As scientists, we have no choice but to live with the scientific method and uphold the ethos of objectivity.

In summary, UNESCO missed a wonderful opportunity to advance the cause of mankind. "Where there is no vision, the people perish."[21]

[21] Proverbs xxix, 18.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Use of Accentuated Environmental Inequalities in Research on Racial Differences

BY ROBERT E. KUTTNER

The respective contributions of environment and heredity to performance on aptitude and achievement tests remains an unsettled scientific question, particularly with regard to racial groups. There is considerable agreement that much of the data collected on this topic have been incorrectly interpreted. This judgment, which should have stimulated new work with improved techniques, has rather served to discourage the additional researches which this problem certainly warrants.

A re-examination of older work indicates that methods of controlling for socio-economic effects were based on sample selections from groups approximately equated according to family background, household inventory and neighborhood characteristics. This approach has been subjected to serious criticism since the sorting criteria are narrow, lack precision and make no allowance for any lag phenomena which may carry over from previous family or group status. These attempts suffer from the added difficulty of failing to provide a key to the psychological status of the matched groups.

Other differences between samples may nullify the pertinence of socio-economic pairing. Immigrant populations, such as Chinese or Jews, who originally scored low on many tests because of a language handicap, now score high because of distinct but unmeasurable cultural qualities—for instance, family organization and reverence for scholarship. Variables of this nature are not susceptible to control and yet represent major influences on the social capacities of groups. Until more sensitive indicators of socio-economic status have been devised, and pending the development of objective techniques to estimate psychological deficits caused by exclusion from the socio-cultural world of the majority, attempts to equate racial groups are hazardous if not futile exercises which contribute little to genetic arguments.

A promising tactic can nevertheless be formulated which escapes the above limitations and may provide useful genetic information. If two populations can be studied which have experienced long-standing differential treatment, and yet both achieve at the same level, then grounds exist for presuming superior potential in one group. Or if one of the two groups responds to ameliorative conditions with a more markedly improved performance then the same

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conclusion can be entertained. This procedure avoids artificially equating a disadvantaged group with the favored majority who may enjoy psychological and cultural benefits that are secondary products of status and hence beyond tabulation. At the same time, comparing deprived groups may isolate the significant variables that contribute most heavily to overall performance.

Five years of observations in a skid row Indian community have convinced me that detribalization and urbanization have proceeded sufficiently far to validate comparisons between Indians and other minority racial groups occupying more entrenched positions in American society. Acculturation for large segments of this population was attained at least one generation ago. Rural Indians have long been exposed to the accouterments of civilization in government and mission schools, to say nothing of the culture-revealing rôle of television. Since World War II bilingualism among younger Indians has tended to disappear. To the degree that the Indian remains unassimilated, he provides a more recent measure of the lingering effects of an older environment which should prejudice his test performance relative to other groups. The absence of a deficit would suggest that historical antecedents are not potent influences on current group potential.

A comparison of Indian and Negro test performances seems appropriate. Both minorities have had disruptive contact over many years with the White majority. Severe obstacles still remain to block the assimilation of these populations into the greater society. The recent publication of a large volume of data on the performance of minorities in the education system of the United States makes it possible to project backwards from a firmly documented contemporary base.[1]

A perspective covering the past century would establish that the criterion for selecting two groups experiencing differential treatment has been adequately met. While the Negro was a subservient but functional part of American civilization, the Indian had barely emerged from a Neolithic culture and was waging guerrilla warfare against intrusive frontier elements. The same regiments that emancipated the Negro were dispatched to exterminate the Indians. The same legislative bodies that sought to guarantee the civil rights of Negroes debated with unprecedented candor the morality of genocidal attacks on peaceful Indians.[2] The same founding declaration which expresses a belief in the equality of men refers to the Indian as a merciless savage.[3]

The necessity for excursions into remote periods may not be

[1] James S. Coleman, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966.

[2] *The Congressional Globe*, 13th January 1865, p. 250.

[3] Thomas Jefferson, *Declaration of Independence*, 1776.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

immediately evident, but many authorities contend that Negro deficiencies today are a legacy of the slave era.[4] Therefore, the possibility of other races bearing the indelible marks of ancient hardships should not be overlooked. The first comparisons of Negro and Indian performance occur two generations after the former population was liberated and the latter pacified and resettled. This interval may have been sufficient to let the effects of these dislocations subside.

One of the largest surveys of Indian school children was conducted in 1921 and ultimately included 1050 subjects.[5] To correct for the fact that many Indians lacked knowledge of the standard amenities of White homes, Garth selected only individuals attending government schools. Whether this served to acquaint these children with furniture, iron kitchenware, combs, mirrors and similar items to an extent enjoyed by White students could not be answered. On the highly verbal National Intelligence Test, fourth to eighth grade Indians attained a median I.Q. of 69 with 1.7 per cent equalling or exceeding the White median. The same investigator examined a similar sized Negro population in Texas where fourth to eighth grade students achieved a median I.Q. of 77 with 8 per cent reaching or surpassing national norms for Whites.[6] Negro students in other educationally retarded regions obtained median scores of 76.6 and 75 on the same tests, with the largest age groups overlapping local White norms by 15 to 31 per cent and 20 to 26 per cent in New Orleans and Arkansas respectively.[7] The local White students also attained a low standard relative to national medians. Garth's findings thus appear to be reliable.

Another intensive survey covered Iroquois Indians in Ontario, Canada.[8] On the same highly verbal National Intelligence Test a median I.Q. of 80 was computed by the Indian psychologist handling the field contacts. The overlap for the Indians, based on United States norms for this text, was stated to be 10 per cent. Comparative data on Ontario Negroes and Whites were obtained a decade later.[9] The median Negro I.Q. was 89, which overlapped the Canadian median score by 20 per cent and the United States White norms by 29 per cent.

[4] Daniel P. Moynihan, *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 1965.

[5] T. R. Garth, "The Intelligence of Full Blood Indians," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. IX, 1925, p. 382.

[6] T. R. Garth and C. A. Whatley, "The Intelligence of Southern Negro Children," *School and Society*, Vol. XXII, 1925, p. 501.

[7] D. Sunne, "Comparison of White and Negro Children in Verbal and Non-verbal Tests," *School and Society*, Vol. XIX, 1924, p. 469; and A. M. Jordan, "Notes on Racial Differences," *School and Society*, Vol. XVI, 1922, p. 503.

[8] E. Jamieson and P. Sandiford, "The Mental Capacities of Southern Ontario Indians," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. XIX, 1928, p. 313.

[9] H. A. Tanser, *The Settlement of Negroes in Kent County, Ontario, and a Study of the Mental Capacity of their Descendants*, Sheppherd, Ontario, 1939.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TABLE I

EARLY TEST PERFORMANCES OF NEGROES AND INDIANS

Population	Number	Test	I.Q.	Percentage of White Overlap	Author
Indian (Southwest Plains)	1050	National Intelligence Test	69	1.7	Garth (1925)
Negro (Texas)	955	National Intelligence Test	77	8.0	Garth (1925)
Negro (Arkansas)	247	National Intelligence Test	75	20-26	Jordan (1922)
Negro (New Orleans)	1112	National Intelligence Test	76.6*	15-31	Sunne (1924)
Indian (Canada)	275	National Intelligence Test	80	10	Jamieson (1928)
Indian (Canada)	280	Pintner Non-Language Mental Test	97	—	Jamieson (1928)
Negro (Canada)	103	National Intelligence Test	89	29 (USA) 20 (Canada)	Tanser (1939)
Negro (Canada)	102	Pintner Non-Language Mental Test	95	10-14 (Canada)	Tanser (1939)

* Test score, not I.Q.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TABLE II

NATIONWIDE MEDIAN TEST SCORES

(From the Coleman Report)

	FIRST GRADE		TWELFTH GRADE					
	Non-Verbal	Verbal	Non-verbal	Verbal	Reading	Mathematics	General Information	Average
Indian	53.0	47.8	47.1	43.7	44.3	45.9	44.7	45.1
Negro	43.4	45.4	40.9	40.9	42.2	41.8	40.6	41.1
White	54.1	53.2	52.0	52.1	51.9	51.8	52.2	52.0

TABLE III

NUMBER OF STANDARD DEVIATIONS BELOW METROPOLITAN NORTHEAST WHITE SCORES

	VERBAL ABILITY			READING COMPREHENSION			MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT		
	Sixth Grade	Ninth Grade	Twelfth Grade	Sixth Grade	Ninth Grade	Twelfth Grade	Sixth Grade	Ninth Grade	Twelfth Grade
Negro, Non-metropolitan South	1.5	1.7	1.9	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.4
Negro, Metropolitan Midwest	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.1	0.9	1.0
American Indian	1.1	1.0	1.1	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.1	0.8	0.7

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE MEASURES OF MOTIVATION (TWELFTH GRADE)

Question Responses	Negro (Non-metropolitan South)	Negro (Metropolitan Midwest)	American Indian
Wants to quit school/Does not care	2	5	11
Do anything to stay in school	49	44	36
Desires to get by/Does not care	2	4	10
Desires to be best	69	48	38
Studies 3 or more hours daily	32	27	17
Studies 0 to $\frac{1}{2}$ hour daily	15	16	25
Seven-plus days avoidable absence per year	2	4	9
No avoidable absence	84	73	60
Read no books in summer	17	25	27
Read 1 to 5 books in summer	46	47	38
Read 16 or more books in summer	10	9	11
Wants to finish college	27	27	22
Wants graduate work	16	19	13

Question Responses	Negro (Non-Metropolitan South)	Negro (Metropolitan South)	American Indian
Definitely plans college	30	33	27
Read college catalog	49	55	50
Inquired about college	22	25	26
Hopes for professional job	25	31	21

TABLE V

PERCENTAGE MEASURES OF SELF-CONCEPT AND SENSE OF CONTROL (TWELFTH GRADE)

Question Responses	Negro (Non-metropolitan South)	Negro (Metropolitan Midwest)	American Indian
Rates self among brightest	17	8	11
Rates self above average	25	28	20
Sometimes cannot learn	24	34	44
Thinks teacher too fast	22	21	26
"Luck is more important than work"	15	9	11
Frustrated when trying	22	23	27
"People like me get no chances"	11	13	14

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The superiority of Negro performance from this period seems established. But there are indications that if more culture-free tests were employed to compensate for the language handicap Indians would achieve a more satisfactory level. In the Ontario study, if subjects who were attending boarding schools for the underprivileged are subtracted, the median I.Q. on the National Intelligence Test rose to 83.7. On the Pintner Non-Language Mental Test, a median I.Q. of 97 fell below the majority norm by only three points. If predominantly English-speaking children were rated, exact parity with American White norms was reached. Corresponding Canadian I.Q. scores for Whites and Negroes were 110 and 95 respectively, with Negro overlaps of 10 to 14 per cent. On this scale select Indian groups outscored Negro students of a decade later, equalled American White scores, but fell short of the Canadian White median.

The substantial ability of Indians on non-verbal tests is confirmed by other authors using the Porteus Maze. A summary of test quotients for advanced and aboriginal races classifies Indians as good performers.[10] The sample included scholastically backward Indian children who were referred to a clinic for diagnosis. Claims that the Porteus Maze is culturally biased are hard to credit in view of the high scores of Australian aborigines. Native Africans, however, did not succeed with this test.

An opinion on Indian potential under favorable economic conditions can be formed from data secured on Osage children who profited from the discovery of oil on tribal land.[11] The Otis Self-Administering Test of Mental Ability, Intermediate Grade, Form A, and the Goodenough Drawing Test, showed Indian and White children from the same schools to be equally proficient. A generation later Nez Perce Indians in Idaho who appeared to be socio-economically on a par with White students were evaluated on the California Mental Maturity Test, the Pintner General Ability Test and the American Council of Education Psychological Examination.[12] Whites from the same environment were slightly superior to the Indians. According to one extensive compilation of Negro test performances, however, in very few instances were Indian scores approached by Negro students.[13]

It must not be supposed that the dramatic rise in Indian scoring was paralleled by a proportionate increase in socio-economic status.

[10] Stanley D. Porteus, "Ethnic Groups and the Maze Test," in *Race and Modern Science* (edited by Robert E. Kuttner), Social Science Press, New York, 1967, pp. 409-427.

[11] J. H. Rohrer, "The Test Intelligence of Osage Indians," *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. XVI, 1942, p. 99.

[12] J. G. Snider and A. P. Coladarci, "Intelligence Test Performance of Acculturated Indian Children," *California Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. XI, 1960, p. 34.

[13] Audrey M. Shuey, *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, Social Science Press, New York, 1966.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Though improvements are undeniable, publications of both liberal[14] and conservative[15] persuasion are unanimous in depicting the Indians as the most aggrieved minority in America. The impression that the gap between Negro and Indian has not been bridged can be verified from census data. Indians are grouped in the non-White category, and it has been necessary to resample many reservation areas to isolate pertinent statistics for this ethnic group.[16] Annual family income was estimated to be $1900 in 1959. For families on reservations the range was between $1500 and $1700. Median family incomes for Negroes and Whites in 1960 were $3233 and $5835 respectively.[17] Indian income is thus 59 per cent of Negro income, which in turn is 55 per cent of the White level.

Life expectancy in 1960 was reported to be 63.6 years for Negroes and 70.6 years for Whites.[18] Comparable statistics for Indians are not available but their average age of death is placed at 43.8 years.[19] For those surviving the first 12 months of life, the average age of death is 53.2 years. Health authorities reported the average age of death for non-Indians in 1957 to be 62 years compared to 39 years for Indians.[20]

Inspection of over 8000 Indian families revealed that 49 per cent live in one or two room structures, 78 per cent use potentially contaminated water, 82 per cent must haul water for domestic use, and 78 per cent have unsatisfactory means of waste disposal. Domestic water consumption is about 20 per cent of the amount used by the poorest rural families in the country.[21]

Infant mortality mirrors the quality of health care received by a community. Negro and White deaths under one year of age for 1947 were found in one survey to be respectively 44.7 and 30.1 for 1000 live births.[22] In 1954 Indian infant mortality was 65.5, and by 1960 it had been reduced to 47.0.[23]

Census tabulations of Negro and White unemployment were 7.5

[14] L. T. King, *Commonweal*, 11th December 1964, p. 385; and *The New Republic*, 30th April 1966, p. 8.

[15] E. Shaker, *The Freeman*, Vol. XIII, 1963, p. 54.

[16] *Indian Health Highlights*, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1966, pp. xi and 5-7.

[17] *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 1967, p. 333.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[19] *Indian Health Highlights*, *op. cit.*

[20] C. J. Wagner, *Hearings, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 88th Congress, May 23, 1963*, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] E. E. Schwartz, *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. XVIII, 1949, p. 240.

[23] C. J. Wagner, *op. cit.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and 3.4 per cent respectively for 1966.[24] A mid-decade survey of one urban slum set Negro unemployment at 14.6 per cent for males and 17.2 per cent for females.[25] Indian unemployment for reservation areas, where two-thirds of this population resides, ranges from 40 to 80 per cent depending on season.[26]

The median number of school years completed by individuals of 25 years of age or older was 8.2 for Negroes and 10.9 for Whites in 1960.[27] Estimates for Indians in 15 reservation states are available, and a comparison of these with census data for non-Whites shows the number of school years completed by this latter category, which is predominantly Negro for most of these areas, to be generally higher. This is illustrated by Arizona and New Mexico, where 25 per cent of the Indian population resides. Indian median schooling is reported to be 2.7 years in Arizona and 4.3 years in New Mexico.[28] The magnitude of the deficit is suggested by the fact that non-Whites in Mississippi—who are almost all Negroes—complete 6.0 school years.

Such data cannot be combined into a single quantitative value which ranks the Indian in present society. But it demonstrates in concrete fashion the relative deprivation of the Indian minority even in terms of Negro standards. Since family income, health, parental education and unemployment are factors deemed important for academic success, the effect of greater disadvantage pertaining to these items ought to be reflected in Negro and Indian comparisons. A suitable test of this hypothesis can be made by examining the Coleman Report.[29] This survey, entitled *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, was sponsored and subsidized by the federal government as an integral part of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Over 4000 schools were rated by questionnaires submitted to principals and teachers. A total of 645,000 students of all races were examined by a battery of psychological tests and simultaneously indexed for relevant background variables. This undertaking is considered to be the most massive assessment of the educational system ever attempted in the United States. A full analysis and interpretation of the Report may not be forthcoming for many years, but for our purposes the general summaries are sufficient.

There appears to be no possible doubt that Indian children outperformed Negroes as a whole. Summary tables indicate that the Indian sample surpassed national Negro scores on all tests. If only

[24] *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

[25] W. Williams, *Trans-Action*, Vol. IV, 1967, p. 33.

[26] R. L. Bennett, *Indian Record*, United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., March 1967, p. 1.

[27] *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-115.

[28] *Indian Health Highlights*, *op. cit.*

[29] James S. Coleman, *op. cit.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

geographic sections containing the top of the Negro distribution are selected, then Indian superiority is reduced to approximate equality. This finding is remarkable in that it represents a reversal of the Negro-Indian position on scholastic performance tests without a corresponding change in socio-economic status.

Since the Indian still suffers from some language handicap, attention should be directed to non-verbal capacity at the lower grades. For the entering school year the Indian is one standard deviation above the standardized Negro score. A difference of this order places Negro overlap at about 16 per cent. This result has escaped comment in early evaluations of the Coleman Report.

The implausibility of attributing this inter-ethnic difference to socio-economic influences leads to a consideration of elusive psychological determinants which may be already operating with differential impact on children at this grade level. The premise that Indians are victims of less overt prejudice appears reasonably sound.[30] The Indian minority is too small to challenge the dominant position of the majority. Upward social movement by the Indian causes little friction and may be below the threshold recognized as threatening by the White community. Perhaps for these reasons the Indian has greater social acceptability than the Negro. Whether this results in less discrimination is not known, since individuals who prefer Indian to Negro associations rarely have the opportunity to put their tolerance to a test. Measures of social distance are abstractions when small and remote minorities are involved.

Allowing for greater discrimination against the Negro, and for such psychological trauma as rejection may engender, we would expect the Negro children in the Coleman study to show evidence of damaged motivation. But the contrary is true: a questionnaire containing sixteen items indicated that Negro pupils in the twelfth grade were more strongly motivated toward school success than were the pupils in the Indian sample. Higher percentages of favorable responses were given by Negro children on fourteen items. I have collected these responses in Tables IV and V. The desire for academic excellence has not been hindered by discrimination relative to Indian responses. This is particularly true for the non-metropolitan Negro from the South.

It may be conceded that volunteered answers, however favorable, do not reveal personality damage. High aspirations may co-exist with impaired performance. However, Negro non-verbal skills in the third grade had increased for all eight geographic subsamples relative to the first grade, and had also improved in six of these regions for verbal tests. Invisible damage from discrimination does not surface on these scales and must therefore remain a speculation.

Indian-Negro differences may result from a methodological bias.

[30] M. C. Langhorne, *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. XVI, 1942, p. 89.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The initially high Indian score on the non-verbal scale declines at the third grade. If more talented children are preferentially enrolled first, such scores would be artificially elevated by the selection factor. Since school enrollment for Indians is below the Negro percentage for every age level,[31] part of the performance gap may be assigned to this cause. At the age of six, Indian enrollment is 6 per cent below the Negro value, which makes this a most trivial influence. The increase in enrollment for Negroes between the age of six and the ages of seven to nine is 17.3 per cent. Indian enrollment for the same ages shows an increase of 19.4 per cent. If the recruitment of substantially the same number of less talented late-starting children increases Negro scores at third grade but depresses Indian scores, then we have conflicting phenomena with unique biasing factors for each group. Ordinary prudence dictates accepting the Negro gain in third grade scores as a delayed result of longer school attendance and greater exposure to "Head Start" or kindergarten programs. Previous school experience may likewise account for the fact that the Negro first grade population is the only ethnic sample of the six examined to have higher verbal than non-verbal scores.

The degree to which the Indian is handicapped by language on the verbal tests at the first grade can be calculated from data in the Coleman Report. A subsample excluding the assimilated Indians in the Northeast region of the United States showed that children from homes where at least one adult spoke another language obtained scores 2.29 points lower than students from English-speaking families.

The same sample was studied for the influence of economic factors. Children from homes lacking television, telephones and vacuum cleaners scored 3.05 units lower than students whose families possessed all three amenities.

Children from homes having both a family newspaper and an encyclopedia scored 2.39 points above children from homes having neither. Non-attendance in kindergarten produced a difference of 0.89 on first grade verbal scores over the group that attended. This may be attributed to the culturally deprived families making greater use of kindergarten facilities.

The data reveal that within the Indian group the influences of socio-economic or cultural factors are definitely operating in the predicted manner and in the expected direction. It is only in inter-ethnic comparisons that these variables fail to exert a proportionate influence.

The lowest verbal score attained was 41.75 in a group of children with no television, telephone or vacuum cleaner in the home, and with the handicap of a language other than English spoken by one adult in the family. Rough inspection of the graphs in the Coleman

[31] James S. Coleman, *op. cit.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Report shows that all eight regional Negro samples exceeded this score. If two subsamples from English-speaking families are selected for inferior households, they surpass the national Negro verbal norm and are matched only by the Negro mid-West metropolitan sample; this latter group scoring approximately 46.5.

A number of other observations introduce questions that are unanswered. The scholastic progress of the Indian during the fifty-year interval since World War I appears to be strongly documented. This incremental response to acculturation has occurred without the attainment of socio-economic parity with our comparison group. At the same time, Negro performance relative to that of the White majority has not been improved according to a considerable body of analytical opinion.[32] If the rapidity of the Indian response can be generalized, the failure of Negro performance to keep pace with that of the dominant majority cannot be attributed to any latency phenomenon. Further, the psychological handicaps of racial distinctness cannot be totally governing since the Indian sample also suffers from rejection and bears the additional burden of a more recent cultural fragmentation.

The factor of heredity cannot be neglected in accommodating to the majority culture. The Indian population has been exposed to ruthless selection during the entire period of contact. The survivors may represent the most able element in the original population. The social capacities of the urban Negro, on the other hand, may have declined as a result of dilution by the products of a more relaxed selection pressure. The rigorous environmental forces that shaped the Negro in the last century no longer seem to be operating.[33] While there are no reasons for lamenting the easier circumstances of today, the genetic changes that may have followed are proper topics for research.

SUMMARY

I have attempted to illustrate the value of a comparative approach to ethnic capacities utilizing disadvantaged minorities who do not enjoy the social and cultural rewards of membership in the dominant society. This has the tendency to compensate for some of the intangible benefits that may prejudice comparisons between any single minority and the White majority. Rather than attempting to equate the ethnic groups for socio-economic factors, I have selected populations with sharply dissimilar backgrounds to highlight the

[32] Audrey M. Shuey, *op. cit.*; Frank C. J. McGurk, "The Culture Hypothesis and Psychological Tests," in *Race and Modern Science*, *op. cit.*, pp. 367-381; and William B. Shockley, "A 'Try Simplest Cases' Approach to the Heredity-Poverty-Crime Problem," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. LVII, 1967, p. 1767.

[33] W. M. Cobb, "The Pursuit of Excellence," *Journal of the National Medical Association*, Vol. LVI, 1964, p. 432.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

influence of these factors on group performance. The results of the comparison of Indian and Negro school children indicate that the former record distinctly superior performance despite a generally inferior socio-economic position in society. This serves to demonstrate that the factors commonly regarded as exerting a decisive formative influence on test performance are strongly modified by the inherent capacities of the groups involved. I do not question the importance of environmental variables as determinants of group performance, but I do emphasize that group responses to such factors may be markedly different.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cultural Differences

A Discussion of their Effects and Causes

By KATHLEEN THAYER

Several decades ago, in a brilliant study which became an anthropological classic, Margaret Mead pictured two strange and sharply antithetical cultures.[1] Situated on the tropical island of New Guinea, only one hundred miles apart, and of closely similar racial stocks, the mild and gentle Arapesh and the fierce Mundugumor were about as far apart in their orientation as it is possible to become and still remain human. The Arapesh were kind, loving, unaggressive and almost totally lacking in individualistic ambition or the competitive spirit; whereas the head-hunting, cannibalistic Mundugumor were so ruthless, so selfish and so overcharged with jealousy, hostility and mutual mistrust that they must have been dangerously close to the point where it would have become impossible for them to survive as a group at all.

These two cultures had obviously sprung from a common origin because many of their outward forms, their trappings and traditions, were identical or closely similar; but since that time of common origin they had evidently grown farther and farther apart.

The fundamental assumption underlying most of modern sociology and anthropology, then as now, is that it is the culture which creates, determines and controls. All differences between human groups in the character of the individuals comprising them, it is assumed, are caused by the impact of the differing cultures upon such individuals. The existence of innate differences between individuals is usually admitted, but the existence of innate differences between groups is denied. It is assumed that the total range of character and personality types and also the respective proportions of such types are identical in all human societies—or, alternatively, that if any differences in frequency distributions of the various types do exist, such differences are of no importance, since they are without effect upon the culture.

No one denies that cultures are created by human individuals, and that cultures differ widely one from another. But these differences, it is assumed, are either fortuitous in origin or are the result

[1] Margaret Mead, *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*, W. Morrow, New York: Routledge, London, 1935. In addition to the mountain-dwelling Arapesh and the river-dwelling Mundugumor, the third primitive society in the title is the lake-dwelling Tchambuli.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of differences in the outward circumstances encountered by groups, and—once established—are self-perpetuating or self-exaggerating.

Hence Margaret Mead, conforming dutifully to the orthodoxy of the day, found adequate explanation for the mildness of the Arapesh individual, and for the hostile fierceness of the Mundugumor, in the widely differing experiences they had had, particularly during infancy and early childhood. The Arapesh child was welcomed and loved by all. He was petted, cuddled and played with endlessly and tenderly, nursed until he was two or three years old and then weaned very gently and patiently. The Mundugumor child, usually resented by one or both of his parents, was left very much alone. He was nursed hastily and irritably and was weaned as early as possible to an accompaniment of blows and angry words. Margaret Mead felt sure that if you were to take an Arapesh child and a Mundugumor child at birth, interchange them, and expose each to the environment normal for the other, the Arapesh child reared among the Mundugumor would be indistinguishable from the rest of the Mundugumor, just as the Mundugumor child would be mild and friendly and unambitious like the Arapesh among whom he was raised.

But, she pointed out, there were individual differences, all the same. Not all of the Arapesh, and not all of the Mundugumor, conformed to their respective cultural patterns. There were the misfits: among the Arapesh, the aggressive, the self-seeking or the hot-tempered; among the Mundugumor, the mild-natured men and women who preferred peace to conflict and who thought of the welfare of others as well as their own. Margaret Mead believed, if I understand her aright, that the range of congenital personality types, of inborn character traits and tendencies, was identical in the two societies, as were the frequency distributions of such congenital traits and tendencies. But the Arapesh culture had somehow selected one extreme, the Mundugumor an opposite extreme, as the ideal human type, and each had been able to "revamp all of their institutions to fit one extreme type and to develop . . . a personality congruent with this extreme emphasis." Yet obviously an individual whose inborn nature predisposed him to the most violent, cruel and aggressive behavior would find it extremely difficult to conform all his life to the gentle and amiable pattern of the Arapesh society. Similarly, individuals born at the extreme of the peaceful-and-mild end of the character range would have a struggle to become fully Mundugumor—no matter how efficient the culture was at molding and shaping its other children into its exact pattern. Hence the misfits.

One such misfit among the Mundugumor, Margaret Mead tells us, was Kwenda, a warm, gentle, loving woman, scorned by all for her atypical behavior. Kwenda adopted one of a pair of twins, and "on the face of Kwenda's twin there was always a dimpling smile, on the face of the child suckled by her own mother, a harsh, set frown"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—the usual frown of distrust and defiance to be found upon the faces of the Mundugumor children.

Let us assume that in any Mundugumor generation there are several such misfits as Kwenda. The little twin whom Kwenda raised, if she is by nature as amiable or nearly as amiable as the average human being, is not going to grow up to be a fully Mundugumor personality. And if the differences between the Mundugumor and other human groups are wholly cultural, the probability is of course extremely high that Kwenda's little twin will be by nature more or less average in this respect. In her generation, therefore, those who are the inborn misfits, like Kwenda, will be joined by those of average temperament who have been strongly influenced by a parent or protector such as Kwenda. In the third generation there are going to be even more un-Mundugumor-like characters: the natural misfits, those raised by the misfits, and those raised by those raised by the misfits—the children of Kwenda's adopted twin, that is to say. This growing number of relatively amiable characters will inevitably soften the cultural environment a bit, and make it less extreme, whereupon even those not directly affected by the misfits or their protégés and descendants will begin to show the effects of the change. This process will be a self-perpetuating one, up to a point. If one generation is a bit milder than the last, the following generation, which has the same heredity but a slightly milder environment, will be milder still. The Mundugumor culture is on its way back: inexorably and fairly swiftly it is making its way, generation by generation, toward a more normal condition of society.

Obviously, then, there is something wrong with this picture. Even two or three such misfits as Kwenda in each generation would speedily destroy the Mundugumor cultural equilibrium and set the pattern off on a dynamic course of change for the better. Moreover, if there are one or more total misfits like Kwenda, then others conforming almost completely to their fierce culture must nevertheless have an innate tendency toward kindliness which, although not so strong as Kwenda's, is yet strong enough to exert some slight modifying effect upon the extreme aggressiveness which the Mundugumor culture has sought to produce in them. These also will help to tip the scale off center, even if by only an infinitesimal amount, and hence will help to destroy the equilibrium, to ensure that the culture will not remain stable but will embark on a dynamic, generation-by-generation course of change which will last until a more normal and "natural" equilibrium has been reached. And that—if the distribution of innate human traits and tendencies among the Mundugumor is average and normal—will be when the culture itself is average and normal. Therefore, if we assume that the Mundugumor culture is stable, has existed in its present form for some time and will continue to do so in the future, we must find some opposing influence to balance the pull of Kwenda and the others toward normalcy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such an influence, of course, can be exerted only by persons whose innate tendency is toward even greater violence and aggressiveness than the Mundugumor cultural pattern prescribes; and their combined influence, expressed as a kind of product of their number and their degree of innate aggressiveness over and above the Mundugumor cultural pattern, must be mathematically equal to the pull exerted by the Kwendas and near-Kwendas and their protégés and descendants. Otherwise the Mundugumor culture will not be in equilibrium and cannot remain stable.

If we should interchange a whole generation of Arapesh and Mundugumor babies at birth it would no doubt at first appear that the environment—the culture—is indeed the all-important and controlling influence, since in this first generation there is little doubt that the Arapesh babies in the Mundugumor cultural environment would grow up to be fiercer and more aggressive than would the Mundugumor babies placed at birth under the soothing and softening influence of the mild Arapesh culture. But—if we are right in thinking that there are differences (however slight) between Arapesh and Mundugumor in the frequency distributions of the various innate traits and tendencies—it is also certain that these same Mundugumor babies, although they will grow up to be much more amiable than they would in their own fierce culture, will nevertheless be less mild and gentle than the Arapesh would have become in *their own* environment—and hence when grown they will also be less mild and gentle than was the generation which reared and trained them. We do not know how big this difference will be—it may be substantial or it may be almost imperceptible—but we do know that it will be mathematically greater than zero. That is all that is needed. The culture is not now in equilibrium; it is not stable but has been thrown into a dynamic state of change. The next generation, genetically the same as the last, will be trained by parents and teachers who are anywhere from infinitesimally to substantially less mild and amiable than the last; and therefore when they in their turn are grown they will be even less amiable. And so it will go on, with each generation being less mild than the last—a process which will continue until equilibrium has been re-established at exactly the original Mundugumor level. (Theoretically, the equilibrium will never quite be attained but will be approached as an asymptote).

The same thing will be happening in reverse, of course, in the Mundugumor culture, now genetically Arapesh. The social life of each generation will be a little more mild and peaceful than the preceding one until the original, Arapesh-type culture has (practically speaking) been regained. At that point, with equilibrium between the cultural life of the society and the congenital tendencies of the members of that society re-established, it will become stable.

It thus appears that a culture will not be in balance or equilibrium until it achieves the best possible match with the inherited

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

propensities of its members. Until that time, the pressure toward such an equilibrium will be constant, steady and relentless—an irresistible force.

If, therefore, heredity does count in determining character, however slightly, and if the frequency distributions of the various hereditary types do vary from group to group, however slightly, it follows that such variances must be an extremely important cause of cultural differences.

As to the first condition, few would maintain that heredity is totally without effect upon character or personality. As to the second, the different races and sub-races of men have evolved under widely differing conditions, often widely separated from each other for long periods of time. As a result the frequency distributions of genes determining physical size and shape, coloring, blood type and inherited physical defects, peculiarities and excellences vary greatly from one group to another. It would therefore surely be surprising if the genes which act upon the nervous and endocrine system were unlike all others in this respect.

One of the most obvious—and probably one of the most important—of the differences in the environments under which various races and stocks of men have evolved is that of climate. Under primitive conditions, in a region characterized by long, cold winters, only those who are energetic, thrifty and provident will survive and will transmit their characteristics to future generations. Where the weather is oppressively hot throughout the year, on the other hand, those who are too energetic may well have a lower than average survival value. It is really very difficult to see how differences in character and personality could help coming about as a result of such differing selective environmental pressures.

It is true, as a whole generation of anthropologists and sociologists has eagerly pointed out to us, that the culture to a great extent molds each one of its children into its own image. But surely also the culture itself is constantly being molded by its children into their own collective group image. The innate tendency of the individual human character or personality may never have a chance to show itself but may—for better or worse—be distorted into something quite different from what it started out. The innate tendency of the *group*, on the other hand, *must* show itself as the generations go by, since it is this innate group tendency which molds and shapes the culture itself in the long run. The more effective we believe the culture to be in shaping its children, the more important hereditary differences between groups become; for the individual is in a sense the prisoner of his group, his character being improved or worsened by it to exactly the degree that we believe his culture, rather than his individual heredity, determines the final form that character will take.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

THE JEW IN AMERICAN POLITICS

By Nathaniel Weyl. Arlington House, New Rochelle, New York, 1968. Pp. 375. Price $6.95.

In so far as this book is primarily concerned with the political aspects of Jewry in America it is not possible to review it at adequate length here. Its theme is the paradoxical rôle of American Jewry, and it discusses why Jews so often range between liberal and radical in their political attitudes. As one would expect from a writer of Mr Weyl's perception, the whole subject is very thoroughly discussed and his book is extremely illuminating in many ways.

The part of the book which is most relevant to the racial aspects of the social upheaval which the United States is undergoing at the present time is the chapter "Jews, Negroes and Civil Rights," which traces the development of the Jewish involvement in the civil rights movement and the changes which have occurred recently in American Negro anti-Semitism.

Mr Weyl shows that American Negroes have a long history of anti-Semitism. A traditional cause of, or pretext for, this anti-Semitism, he says (p. 281), is that

> a large proportion of the businesses of the black ghettos are Jewish-owned and a considerable proportion of the landlords in these slums are also Jewish. These Jewish businessmen and property owners are habitually referred to as "blood suckers" by Negroes and accused of making their money in the colored districts and then moving to fine new houses in lily-white suburbia.

He cites evidence that as Negroes move into Jewish neighbourhoods the Jews move out. He also states (p. 283): "Sherman observes that 'we are still confronted with the sad fact that crime *does* increase when Negroes enter a neighborhood.'" On the subject of the Negro hatred of the Jews, Weyl quotes (p. 286) an official of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) as telling Jews in Mount Vernon, New York, that "Hitler made one mistake when he didn't kill enough of you."

Mr Weyl says that perhaps the main cause of the growing cleavage between the Negroes and the Jews is that the Jews "have fought for Negro equality of opportunity only to discover that this is not what the Negroes want." He continues (p. 287):

> What the Negroes are asking for today . . . is as old as the concept of caste. It is the notion that each group is entitled to "its fair share" without regard to its ability or its contribution to production. The new Negro revolution is essentially a return to the old concept of a society based upon status. It is a formula for rewarding the incompetent, for stultifying progress, for quick-freezing innovation and for reverting to a Diocletian or Byzantine conception of man's relationship to the state.

What is the answer? Mr Weyl says (p. 290):

> The fundamental solution for the Jews is disengagement. It means a moratorium on empty moralistic twaddle, an end to the cant and claptrap about equality of talents and an end to the search for some special alliance and empathy between the two groups. Once the emotional binge is over, Jews can look at the Negro problem with sober, morning-after eyes and support those measures, and only those measures, which will help the Negro to advance by his own efforts and be of benefit to the nation as a whole.

The Jew in American Politics is a valuable contribution to the literature on American Jewry and Negro-Jewish relations which will no doubt become a standard authority on the subject.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SPECIFIC SURVIVAL

By G. Pantel. The Triangle, London, 1968. Pp. 94. Price 27s: $3.25.

This book deals with, amongst others, the following topics: progressive interference with the survival of man; inherent balance; identifying the adversely affected among crossbreds; compensatory tendency characteristic of the adversely affected crossbred; specific survival call; how to check specifically detrimental activities; causal relationships underlying induced mass-hybridisation; and interracial hybridisation and individual as distinct from specific survival standards. It also contains an appended paper on "The Essential Professional Standard Undertaking of a Medical Practitioner," along with references and an index.

The import of the work is the presentation of the view that hybridisation is deleterious and not beneficial to mankind. The author's point of view might well be summarised by his statement on page 56, with which many will be in full agreement:

> The deleterious consequence of hybridisation observed (Part I) refers to these four thoroughly distinct developmental groups, the Euroid, the Caspoid, the Mongoloid and the Negroid. It is, of course, the evidence of this deleterious consequence that stamps the ultimate genetical and developmental validity upon a racial distinction. Equally, it is the operative tendency of spontaneous segregation that accounts for the sub-specific development of a race, unless it is effectively interfered with—as is the case, at an alarmingly increasing rate throughout this century, under the influence of the induced mass-hybridisation drive.

Dr Pantel also deals not only with hybridisation between races but with the question of differentials between various classes within each stock.

BLACK HISTORY: A REAPPRAISAL

Edited by Melvin Drimmer. Doubleday and Company, New York, 1968. Pp. 553. Price $6.95.

This book is a compilation of articles and book excerpts by a number of writers on Negro life and history. Some attention is given to early African history, but most of the volume is devoted to such topics as slavery in America, the emancipation of the slaves, Negro life in America and the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court outlawing segregation in the schools.

The essays differ widely in length and quality. Among the best is that of the historian John Hope Franklin, a Negro professor at the University of Chicago. His paper on the South's new leaders is comparatively free of bias. Not so good is an article on African history in Africa by Philip D. Curtin, Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin. This account is full of generalities, doubtful speculations and frequent references to Egypt's civilization and that of North Africa, as though the Blacks (as Africans) must have become civilized by osmosis.

Some of the most unreliable writings are the glamorized accounts of the West African kingdoms by Basil Davidson; the sentimental article by W. E. B. Du Bois, an admitted Communist; and comments by Staughton Lynd, Arthur Schlesinger and I. F. Stone. The latter's article deals with Malcolm X, the Black Muslim.

There is an extensive bibliography of carefully selected works on the Negro (mostly highly favorable). The editor is Melvin Drimmer, Professor of History at Negro Spelman College in Atlanta, Georgia. Drimmer was one of Du Bois's students. The book may be valuable if read judiciously.

HENRY E. GARRETT.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SEXUAL WILDERNESS

By Vance Packard. Longmans, Green and Company, London, 1968. Pp. 553. Price 36s.

This book, by the author of *The Status Seekers*, is a comprehensive survey of the prevailing sexual climate, especially in the United States, which reflects the chaos and confusion of belief, standards and behaviour in our time. Although this is the main subject of the book, there are several discussions of anthropological interest.

Thus, citing Daniel P. Moynihan in his report *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*, Vance Packard says that the Negro home is a matriarchate in which the father is often not visible or, if he is, it is demoralised "by our Society" (*sic*); and in homes where the father disappears the I.Q. of the children on average drops seven points (p. 387). The inference from this is that nearly half of all Negro families are headed by a woman. This accounts for the lower I.Q. performance of the Negroes. It does not seem to occur to these people that the feckless males, who on average will have lower I.Q.s, will be just those who will not take on the responsibilities of a husband, and so their children will be less intelligent than those of more responsible fathers. It is not the absence of the fathers which causes the lower I.Q.; it is the very fact that such poor stuff were the fathers. This would be so whatever the race.

The author draws attention (pp. 388-389) to the study made by two psychologists at St Louis University in which they carried out tests for passivity. They found that boys from fatherless homes showed a greater tendency to passivity than those from homes where there was a father. This, however, need not be attributed solely to the environmental influence of the absence of the father, but in part at least would be due to a higher proportion of feckless male parents in the one group than in the other. It is interesting, however, to note that in both groups the Negro boys showed a greater tendency to passivity than the White. The Negro boys were more "demasculised" than the White ones. Obviously, genetic and racial genetic factors were involved in both groups.

In an appendix to chapter nine Mr Packard, while drawing attention to the fact that between 1940 and 1963 illegitimacy increased three times in the United States, says that the Negroes contributed 58 per cent of the total in 1963. Considering the difference in the sizes of the two populations, it is clear that, despite this tripling of the illegitimacy rate from 7.1 to 22.5 per thousand, the Whites still have a much lower rate than the Negroes.

Printed by Lindsay and Company Limited, Edinburgh

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ethnological Elements of Africa

By R. GAYRE OF GAYRE

This collection of essays on African ethnology originally appeared as a series of articles published during the last few years in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY. They have now been revised where necessary and brought together in this book which does not set out to deal in detail with every aspect of this vast subject but attempts to synthesise the major racial elements of Africa, to indicate their relationships and differences, and to formulate a theory of the racial origins of the African populations of our times.

170 pages *15 plates*

27s 6d $5.00

THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

1 DARNAWAY STREET, EDINBURGH 3, SCOTLAND

Population Review

A JOURNAL OF ASIAN DEMOGRAPHY

Editor: S. CHANDRASEKHAR

The contents of the TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY ISSUE *include:*

The Crowded World by Sir Julian Huxley; Population Growth in the United States by Professor Philip M. Hauser; The Causes of Poverty: a Clinical View by Dr John Kenneth Galbraith; Population and Freedom by Professor Joseph J. Spengler; The Indians of British Guiana by Dr G. C. L. Bertram; Population Problems in a Developing Economy by Professor S. Chandrasekhar; The Ethnic Groups of Malaya: a Population Study by Dr Mukul K. Dey.

Published by

INDIAN INSTITUTE FOR POPULATION STUDIES

GANDHINAGAR, MADRAS-20, INDIA

Price Rs 5. *Annual Subscription* Rs 10 . £1 . $4.00

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VERITAS BOOKSHOP

for conservative books on

RACE DIFFERENCES

SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT

SOUTH AFRICA and AFRICA

Write for book lists to

P.O. Box 2052, Pretoria, South Africa

The Rhodesian crisis is YOUR crisis!

Lenin said: "First we will take eastern Europe. Next the masses of Asia. Then we shall encircle that last bastion of capitalism, the United States. We shall not have to attack. It will fall into our hands like an overripe fruit."

Rhodesia is fighting YOUR battle NOW!

If she goes under YOU ARE NEXT!

Read RHODESIA AND WORLD REPORT

Published monthly. Annual subscription: surface mail £1 2s 6d ($3.50); air mail £2 5s ($10.50).

P.O. Box 1871, Salisbury, Rhodesia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GENUS

The official publication of the

ITALIAN COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF POPULATION PROBLEMS

Published under the auspices of
the National Research Council
Editor: NORA FEDERICI

Genus publishes articles in Italian, English, French, German and Spanish on subjects in the various sciences (including demography, sociology, economics, general biology, genetics, eugenics, anthropology, social hygiene, psychology and geography) related to population problems.

The Scientific Committee of *Genus* is composed of the members of the Technical Committee of the Italian Committee for the Study of Population Problems: V. Castellano, University of Rome; P. Fortunati, University of Bologna; G. Genna, University of Rome; G. L'Eltore, University of Rome; G. A. Maccacaro, University of Milan; I. Scardovi, University of Bologna; and Nora Federici (President).

Volume XXII, 1966, contains papers presented to the international symposium on "Statistics as Methodology of Social Sciences" held in Rome in March 1966.

The annual subscription to *Genus* is $10.00 (or equivalent), and subscriptions should be sent to: Segreteria del Comitato Italiano per lo Studio dei Problemi della Popolazione, Via Ombrone 8, Rome 00198, Italy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Single issue—7s 6d ($1.50); annual subscription (4 issues)—£1 5s ($5.00); three year subscription (12 issues) —£3 10s ($14.00). Post free by surface mail. Copies will be sent by air mail on payment of an extra £1 8s ($5.00) per year or 7s ($1.25) per copy. Back numbers are supplied while available at 9s ($1.75) each. No responsibility can be accepted for copies lost in the post after dispatch.

CONTRIBUTIONS

All material submitted for publication in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY must be fully and finally corrected, and must be in clear, double-spaced typing, preferably in triplicate. A short biographical note and a suitable photograph of the author may be sent with the article for inclusion if space permits.

The Editors do not accept responsibility for the views expressed by individual contributors.

PAYMENT TO AUTHORS

Authors of articles published in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY are now paid at the rate of one guinea or $3 per printed page, and they also receive twelve free copies of the issue concerned. This applies to articles received after the 1st of January 1967.

1 DARNAWAY STREET, EDINBURGH 3,
SCOTLAND

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED